(SRI B. D. JATTI)

(*d*)—

The ore reserves of the Mines as at 31st March 1958 are given below:—

Payable Ore Reserves	Dwt. per ton	Gold Ounces	Estimated low grade ore	Dwt. per ton	Gold Ounces
2,006,462	9.64	967,115	2,054,253	3.59	368,738

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Re : **Closure of 54 branches of Pir Bidi Factory at Mysore.**

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Sri Srinivas Shetty. It relates to the illegal closure of 54 branches of the Pir Bidi Factory at Mysore.

Sri Mallaradhya also has sent notice of a similar motion.

†SRI T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Law, Labour and Local Self-Government).—Sir, there is one Bidi Factory by name Pir Bidi Factory in Mysore. In 56 branches workers were engaged on piece work or contract basis where the minimum wage by means of an agreement was fixed at Rs. 1-14-0 per thousand bidis, recently by the Conciliation Officer there. At the time when there was trouble a few months back the Pir Bidi Factory owner said that he would not pay this amount, that these 56 branches were not his that they were doing work on contract or on piece work basis and that since the bidi workers were not working in the factory they were not entitled to get the benefit of the agreement. He persisted in refusing to grant them this facility and he closed all those 56 branches, closed in the sense that he refused to take the bidis manufactured by these workers and they were virtually closed by 11th April 1959. Negotiations were conducted between the labourers and the management of the Pir Bidi Factory. The Conciliation Officer tried his best with the assistance and help of the Deputy Commissioner of the place, but the management would not yield. The President of the Association one Sri Aziz Sait began his fast and he was on fast for six continuous days. Subsequently, because of the efforts of the Labour Officers and the Deputy Commissioner the matter has heen settled and the Pir Bidi Factory has agreed to purchase all the bidis manufactured in those 56 branches. The lock-out has ended, work has begun and all the 1300 workers have resumed work. Sri Aziz Sait, I am told, has given up his fast cansequent upon the agreement.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER.—When?

SRI T. SUBRAMANYA.—On the 25th night I got information and I think he must have broken his fast on the 25th night a itself. I have got information that he has broken his fast. This is the situation and I think there is no necessity to press this adjournment motion.

SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapur).—In view of the statement made by the Hon'ble Minister I do not press the motion.

MYSORE VILLAGE PANCHAYATS AND LOCAL BOARDS BILL, 1959.

Motion to consider—(contd.)

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—I would like to invite the attention of the Minister to the wordings in clause 130,

"It shall be the duty of every Taluk Board to make, subject to to such exceptions and conditions as may from time to time be made or imposed by the Government in this behalf, reasonable provision for the following matters within the area under its jurisdiction..." That is all right.

"...and outside that area when effective provision for the purpose cannot be made within the area under its jurisdiction."

I do not know what it means; I am not able to understand it at all.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Supose they want to carry out the work within their jurisdiction, the work cannot be completed unless they make a provision for some kind of work outside their jurisdiction also. If they want to take it up they must have power to provide for work even outside their jurisdiction.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—What the Hon'ble Minister says is all right; but it does not read like that here. In spite of my best efforts I am not able to make any sense of what is written here.

†Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sub-clause (1) reads:

"It shall be the duty of every Taluk Board to make, subject to such exceptions and conditions as may from time to time be made or imposed by the Government in this behalf, reasonable provision for the following matters within the area under its jurisdiction and, outside that area when effective provision for the purpose cannot be made within the area under its jurisdiction."

If in a case they are not able to effectively execute the work within that area and they have to extend the same work beyond the area they must have some power to make provision for it. I will tell you why. Suppose there is a water supply scheme. They will have to sink a well probably outside their jurisdiction. In such a case they may have to spend money outside their jurisdiction and for that purpose they will have to get power under this Act to make provision for some work outside the jurisdiction.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Anyhow I do not want to argue the matter, but I think a very clear statement as to the intentions of the Government may be made and the words changed. I have not been able to understand whether it is good English; what is written here does not convey the expression which the Hon'ble Minister has made.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I do not want to enter into a discussion whether the language is good. If the language is not good, the idea has been made clear. If any other clearer language is suggested, I may think of accepting it.

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Now coming to the main suggestions made by my friend Sri B. Chamiah, I would like to invite the attention of the Hon'ble Minister to the additional proviso that has been suggested.

"Provided also that it shall be the responsibility of Government to take over and maintain all the educational institutions under the control of the District and Panchayat Boards at the time this Act comes into force."

In regard to the obligatory functions contemplated by the Taluk Boards as visualised in the Act, I am afraid we are trying to pitch our demand very high. Having regard to the allocation that has been agreed upon under the previous sections, I do not think even 5 per cent of the Taluk Boards constituted as they are going to be, will ever be in a position to undertake even 10 per cent of the obligatory duties contemplated. By what stretch of imagination do Government contemplate the establishment of dispensaries, veterinary hospitals, travellers' bungalows, rest houses, etc.? In fact, in spite of the best efforts of Government there are very important areas in the State where the Government or the District Boards have not been able to set up or establish guest houses and they are not able to run dispensaries, veterinary hospitals and all that. Unless you want pious hopes expressed as mentioned in the particular section,

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

if you want to be realistic I think it is better that you divest some of the Taluk Boards of the responsibility and the Government take it over. After all, the maintenance of the health of the people of any particular area in an optimum condition is the primary responsibility of the State. They may come to the rescue. If you ask for contribution it is all-right, but to make them responsible for maintenance or running hospitals, I think it would be unrealistic and you would be expecting them to do things which would be beyond their capacity. If it is the obligatory function, you will have endless trouble after the Boards are constituted. You must kindly try to revise item (v) of sub-clause (1) of clause 130.

So far as the responsibility for education is concerned, times out of number Government have said that the question of primary education is their responsibility and that they would like to take over that responsibility throughout the State. In a few cases of course if private managements want to be in charge, Government would not mind; but if Taluk Boards have got to be entrusted with the maintenance and running of these institutions, where is the money to come from and what exactly are the types of financial assistance that you will render to the Taluk Boards to manage these institutions? Suppose there are half a dozen high schools or two high schools within the limits of the jurisdiction of any Taluk Board. Now if they happen to be private or Government institutions, what is the definite responsibility that you want the Taluk Board to shoulder in regard to this matter? Where can they find funds? You know in the case of municipal high schools many complaints must have reached you that to a large majority of teachers regular salaries have not been paid; the standard of education is very low; there is not much of cordiality and more than anything else their financial resources are very meagre and as a result of that, education at the secondary level has suffered. So if you make these Taluk Boards responsible for education up to the secondary grade level, what is to happen and where is the money to come from? That is the reason why I said, if you had only thought of the basis of calculation what exactly do you expect them to do? Is the money that you give, sufficient to meet those demands? I do not think that it is ever possible for more than five per cent—even 5 per cent is a very liberal estimate; not more than five per cent can undertake responsibility which you contemplate under the obligatory duties. I do not want to go into the question of discretionary duties. When that section is taken up, I will speak about it. My friend Mr. Chamiah wants to add another proviso to sub-clause (1) as follows:

> "Provided also that it shall be the responsibility of Government to take over and maintain all the educational institutions under the control of the District and Panchayat Boards at the time this Act comes into force."

If you do not do it, it will be a needless responsibility and impossible responsibility which you are showing on the Taluk Boards. In view of that, I want the Minister to kindly consider this amendment and accept it.

In regard to sub-section (2), why I want to invite the attention of the Minister is that if any one or two Panchayats or Taluk Boards are taken as examples and the actual cost worked out, it will be 100 per cent more than what you propose to do. I worked out one or two village panchayats or taluk Boards. I think Government will certainly have the satisfaction of having placed a Bill like that on the statute book. In the ultimate analysis, not even 5 per cent of Taluk Boards or 10 per cent of Village Panchayats will ever have reason to be satisfied though the Bill has been passed into law.

1 P.M.

So, in any case, we have gone too far; we have come to the third reading of the Bill; the Bill will be passed by the end of this evening. My point is particularly in regard to assigning

obligatory functions to Taluk Boards. I want the Minister to be reticent and not simply load with unnecessary things which are far beyond the capacity of the Taluk Board to function. Having said this, Sir, I want the Minister to kindly accept these amendments.

†Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY (Chicknaikanahalli).—I support the amendment Sir. You are aware that every Taluk is having two to three District Board schools, two or three dispensaries. How much money they have to share for the maintenance of these schools, hospitals and veterinary hospitals, you are not in a mood to include this. As a matter of fact, for every High school you require about Rs. 5,000 to Rs. 6,000. According to the reorganised scheme you give Rs. 1,000 for a high school and for two hospitals it will be about 4,000 and for two dispensaries, you give Rs. 2,000 contribution to the Local Board. What is the establishment charges that you are going to give for the maintenance of these institutions? As it is, there are Taluk Boards which may get about Rs. 25,000 and some of them may get more. Such being the case, what is the use of adding so much of burden on the Taluk Board? Under these circumstances, atleast if you take over the management of High Schools and Hospitals, the Board will be in a position to function; thereby you would also support the amendment.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲೇಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಚಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು ಬಹಳ ಅನುಭವಶಾಲಿಗಳು; ರೈತರ ಕಷ್ಟ ಸುಖಗಳನ್ನು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಅರಿತು ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಬಹಳ ಅನುಭವಶಾಲಿಗಳು. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಬಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದರೆ ನೀವು ಈಗ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ತಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಬ್ರಿಟಿಷರು ತಮಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಇಂಡಿಯಾವನ್ನು ಆಳಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು, ಸ್ವರಾಜ್ಯ ಕಾಲ ಸಮೀಪಿಸಿದಾಗ ಮಾಡಿದ ಹಾಗಿದೆ. ಅವರಿಗಿರುವ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವರಾಜ್ಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೋ, ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ನೀವು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು, ಅವರೇ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಣ್ಣೀರು ಒರಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಾಲ ಸಮೀಪಿಸುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಎಂದೋ ಏನೋ! ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಪಂಚಾಯ್ತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಫಂಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಲ್ಲ, ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೇ? ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ. ನಿಮಗೆ ರೈಲ್ವೇಯಿಂದ, ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿಯಿಂದ, ಇನ್‌ಕಂಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್‌ನಿಂದ, ಸೇಲ್ಸ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್‌ನಿಂದ, ಎಕ್ಸೈಸಿನಿಂದ, ಮತ್ತು ಇನ್ನಿತರ ಬಾಬುಗಳಿಂದ ಇಷ್ಟು ಅದಾಯ ಬಂದೂ, ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಏನು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ? ನಿಮ್ಮಿಂದ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ಏನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅದರಿಂದ ರೈತನಿಗೆ ಏನು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಾ? ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಧೀರ್ಘವಾಗಿ ಆಲೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ಚಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಾವು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ. ತಮ್ಮ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮುದ್ರೆ ಬಿದ್ದು, ಇದರಿಂದ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಒದಗಿಸಿದರೆ, ಇದೆಲ್ಲಾ ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಆಗುವುದರಿಂದ ಜನಗಳು ಯಾರ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಆಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಓದಿ ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ; ಅದರಿಂದ ತಮಗೆ ಕೀರ್ತಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ತಮಗೆ ರೈತರ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸೌಜನ್ಯವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರೋ, ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗ ತೋರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಯುದ್ಧ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಶತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಾಡಬೇಡಿ. ಈಗ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವ ಅವಕಾಶ ತಮಗೆ ಒದಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಸದವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ವ್ಯಥೆಪಟ್ಟರೆ, ಉಪಯೋಗವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಂದಿರುವ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಸದುಪಯೋಗಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿ, ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ (ಶ್ರವಣ ಬೆಳಗೊಳ).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, ವಿಲೇಜು ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಲೋಕಲ್ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ, ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ 130 ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಬಹು ಆಳವಾಗಿದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಪಿತ್ರರು ಬಹಳ ಅನುಭವದಿಂದ ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಬ್-ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ (iii) ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. "Construction, repair, and maintenance of minor irrigation works, that is, irrigation works which provide irrigation facilities for an area not exceeding 10 acres of land" ಇವೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಫಂಕ್ಷನ್ ಎಂದು ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯ.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಇದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಸಣ್ಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ನೂರು ಪೈಸಿನರ್ ಕೆರೆಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಂದಾಯದ ಶೇಕಡ 20 ರಷ್ಟು ಫಂಡನ್ನು ಪ್ರೊವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಪೈಸಿನರ್ ಇರಿಗೇಷನ್ ಕೆಲಸ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲು.ಡಿ. ಯವರು ಲೋಕಲ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮೇಲೆ, ಲೋಕಲ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲು.ಡಿ. ಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಹಾಕಬಹುದು. ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲು.ಡಿ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ)

ಯವರು ಇದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಡ್ಯೂಟಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಕ್ಲಾಸಿನಿಂದ, ಈ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿಯೇ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬಹುದು. ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿದರೆ, ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ನರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ "establishment, management, maintenance and inspection of hospitals, dispensaries, veterinary hospitals, markets, travellers' bungalows, resthouses and other public institutions and the construction and repair of all buildings connected with these institutions" ಬೇರೆ ಇದೆ. ಪಿ.ಬಿಡ್ಲ್ಯು.ಡಿ. ಯಮೇಲೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು, ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ, ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೆ ಕನಿಷ್ಠಪಕ್ಷ 50 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳ ರಿಪೇರಿಯ ನಲುವಾಗಿ ಮೀಸಲಾಗಿಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಈ 20 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಸೆಸ್‌ಏನ, ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಸೋರ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಪ್ರೊವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ? ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಎಕ್ಸೈಸ್ ಡ್ಯೂಟಿ ಹೊರಟು ಹೋಯಿತು. ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು 400 ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅದರ ನೆಟ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯು ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಂದರೆ 22½ ಸಾವಿರ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸೆಸ್ ಒಂದು 25 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಸುಮಾರು 45 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬಂದ ಹಾಗಾಯಿತು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯ.—ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗೆ, 20 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟೆಂದರೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—50,000 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆಗಬಹುದು. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಎಸ್ಟಾಬ್ಲಿಷ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಏನು ? ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಈ ಖರ್ಚು ಸುಮಾರು 20 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನೀವು ಹಾಸ್ಪಿಟಲ್ ಮತ್ತಿತರ ಗ್ಯಾಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ನಿಲ್ ಬ್ಯಾಲೆನ್ಸ್ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ನೀವು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುವಾರು ಒಂದೊಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೆ ಕನಿಷ್ಠ ಪಕ್ಷ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಬರುತ್ತದೆನ್ನುವ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟ್‌ಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಫಿಗರ್ಸ್ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು, ಮತ್ತು ಎಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಇದ್ದುವು. ನೀವು ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರೊವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಈಗ ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ರಾಗ ಎಳೆಯಬಹುದು. ನೀವು ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳು ಅದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸಲು ಅಶಕ್ತರಾದುದರಿಂದ, ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ನಾವು ಟೈಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ನೀವು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಸನ್ನು ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಬಲ್ಲಿನಿಂದ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ "Construction, repair and maintenance of Government primary buildings" ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ 100-200 ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ಸ್ಕೂಲುಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವುದು ಮತ್ತು ಇವುಗಳನ್ನು ರಿಪೇರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನೂ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿದರೆ, ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ರಿಪೇರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಎ.ಆರ್. ನಿಂದ ಐದು ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟಿನಂತೆ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ, ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳ ವೈಟ್ ವಾಶ್ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ? ಹೇಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಮಾಡುವುದು ? ಇಪ್ಪೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ (2)ನ್ನು ನೀವು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿಗೆ ನಾವು ಏನೂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕಾರ್ಪಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನೇರವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇರುವಾಗ ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ಸ್ಕೂಲ್ ಕಟ್ಟಡ ಕೂಡ ನಮಗೆ ಪ್ರೊವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM (Kolar Gold Fields).—Most of the primary schools are run in temples.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಅದು ನರಿ, ಆದರೂ ಕೂಡ ನಬ್ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ (2) ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಬೇಕು. ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ (2), (3), (4) ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಿ ಪೂರ್ತಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—130ನೆಯ ಕಲಂ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕಲಮಿಗೆ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಕೂಡ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಉಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಏತಕ್ಕೆಂದರೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಯಾವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಇಬೆಯೋ ಆ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ನೆರವೇರ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಈ ಶಾಸನ ಕಡಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಬಲ್ಲು ಏರುವುದು ನಮಂಜನ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಕಾಣಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲ ಏನೇನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಎಜುಕೇಷನ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸ, ವೆಟರಿನರಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅನಿಮಲ್ ಹಜ್‌ಬೆಂಡ್ರಿ ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸ, ಡಿಸ್ಪೆನ್ಸರಿಸ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ಲೋಕಲ್‌ಸೆಲ್ಫ್ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಇಲಾಖೆ ಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸ ಇವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಭುಜ ತಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೇಳಿದರು, ದೇಶದ ಆದಾಯದ ಅರ್ಧ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಡಿಪಾರ್ಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟಿನವರು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಮತ್ತು ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಅವುಗಳಿಂದ ಏನು ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿದೆ. ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಹೊರಿಸಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದು ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಬದಿರಿನ ಬಲ್ಲು ಬಾಣ ಹಿಡಿದು ಅಶ್ವತ್ಥಾಮನ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಣ್ಣ ಬಳಿದ ಬಿಳಿ ಆನೆಯನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಅಶ್ವತ್ಥಾಮೋ ಹತಃ ಕುಂಜರಃ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ವೇದ ಉಪನಿಷತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲರುವ ಅಕ್ಷರ ಜೋಡಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ? ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ಸ್ಕೂಲುಗಳ ರಿಪೇರಿ

ಮತ್ತು ಸಣ್ಣ ಸಣ್ಣ ಮೈನರ್ ಇರಿಗೇಷನ್ ರಿಸ್ಟೋರ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಮೈನರ್ ಇರಿಗೇಷನ್ ಹೇಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ? ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರ ತಕ್ಕ ಹಣ ಸಾಲದು. ಹಿಂದೂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಪೊದಲನೆಯ ಎರಡು ಪಂಚ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಗುರಿಯನ್ನು ಮುಟ್ಟಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಂದೇ ದಿವಸದಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಯಾ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳು ತಮಗೆ ಇರುವ ಅವಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಪ್ಲಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಿದ್ಧಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ನಮ್ಮ ಗುರಿಯನ್ನು ಮುಟ್ಟಬೇಕು. 50 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಗ 5 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಸಾಲ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಸಾಲ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ 25 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ರಸ್ತೆಗಳು ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ರಿಪೇರಿ ಮಾಡಿ, ದನದ ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಒಂದು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗೆ ಎರಡು ಸಾವಿರ, ಮೂರು ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಔಷಧಿಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದೊಂದು ರಸ್ತೆಗೂ ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಕಡಮೆ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡರೂ 500 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಹತ್ತಾರು ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಹಣ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ? ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಅಬ್ಲಿಗೇಟರಿ ಫಂಕ್ಷನ್ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಇದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಜಯಪ್ರದ ವಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ತಾವು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಮಗೆ ಖಂಡಿತ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ತಾವು ಹಣ ಕೊಡಿ, ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಏನು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ.

ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ತಾವು ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿ.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The very object of the formation of the Taluk Board will be defeated if financial help is not given by the Government. Therefore, Sir, it is an important section in the Bill, and I am pressing this point to accept the amendment. Let them give adequate financial help to the Taluk Board. That is why I am appealing, I am not critising. If they want to fulfil all the objects under Section 130, they must see that adequate financial help is given to these Taluk Boards. In the absence of adequate finance, it will be a miserable failure and it will be a mockery in the eyes of the public. Hence I request the Government to accept this amendment or to give an assurance that these Taluk Boards will be given enough money to discharge the duties which have just come within the purview of Section 130. Hence I appeal to the Minister who has got the greatest wisdom, who has got the most ripe experience to see that sufficient money is provided or this amendment should be accepted.

†Sri K. KENCHAPPA (Hiriyur).—My amendment is to the effect that in sub-clause (i), item (xvii) shall be deleted. As has been represented by my Hon'ble friend, so far the Government are seeking to thrust greater responsibility on the shoulders of the Local Boards which are incapable of functioning with all responsibilities. I also say that this clause is a further burden and not a small burden. By this clause the Government may throw on the shoulders of the Local self-Government as much burden as all the other clauses. There is absolutely no limit to the Government to transfer any kind of work. The wording is like this :

> "such other matters as may be entrusted to the Taluk Board by the Government from time to time."

Whatever they may say, any other functions may be transferred according to this clause to the Taluk Board. As has been already represented, we have been feeling great responsibility and we have been feeling that the clauses are imposing impossible conditions on the Taluk Boards to function. In addition to that, the Government go on transferring responsibilities one after another, according to item 17. There seems to be no end. There is a proviso also and that says :

> "Provided that when duties are entrusted under item (xvii) to the Taluk Boards which cannot be financed out of the normal income of the Board."

Who is to decide ? Supposing for argument's sake, tomorrow by transferring any item of work to the Taluk Board the Government may say that in their opinion the financial condition of the Taluk Board is sufficiently strong. Because they may shoulder the responsibility, the Government have transferred it. What prevents the Government from transferring such a responsibility ? The public will see that the responsibility is that

(SRI K. KENCHAPPA)

of the Taluk Board when they are not capable of doing that function. The proviso further says that the Government shall provide the necessary funds in case they feel that the financial position of the Taluk Board is week or place the services of such officers at the disposal of the Board as the Government deems fit. Supposing for argument's sake Government feel that the position of the Taluk Board is financially weak, then they may say that some amount may be given. Suppose out of 500 or 600 miles they take over 25miles under their control for maintenance and transfer 475 miles of the incomplete roads or roads formed in bits here and there and ask the Taluk Boards to maintain them ; is it possible for them to maintain them? The Government may say that they have taken over 25 miles and that the responsibility to maintain to that extent is taken over by them and that it is the responsibility of the village panchayat to maintain the rest of the roads. If they are not maintained well the public will clamour that the Local self-Governing institution, in other words, the Taluk Board is incapable of maintaining these roads in a good condition, that these roads are not fit for vehicles and not even fit for walking. Such being the case, there seems to be no limit for the Government to feel the capacity of the Taluk Board to function with so many responsibilities. Therefore in addition to the representations made by my colleagues that there are very heavy responsibilities thrust on them and therefore those clauses may be deleted, I also plead that this clause too may be deleted. If this clause is retained there is greater danger as we have got experience of the District Boards in the past. I pray with all the interest I command that this sub-clause may be deleted. While substantiating this, I bring to the notice of the members clause 136 (1) which runs thus:

> "It shall be lawful for the Government from time to time to direct by notification that any road, bridge, channel, building or other property, moveable or immoveable which is vested in the Government and which is situated within a taluk, shall, with the consent of the Taluk Board of such taluk, and subject to such exceptions and conditions as the Government may make and impose, be placed under the control and administration of the Taluk Board for the purposes of this Act and thereupon such road, bridge, channel, building or other property shall be under the control and administration of the Board, subject to all exceptions and conditions so made and imposed and to all charges and liabilities afftcting the same."

So is there no limit at all for the Government to conceive the responsibilities of Local self-Government while operating these functions ? Therefore, in short, I do not want to proceed further. the Select Committee should not have gone to the extent of feeling that the Taluk Boards are capable of carrying out all these responsibilities. Therefore, I request that item (xvii) of sub-clause (1) may be deleted.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಸ್. ಶಂಕರಪ್ಪ (ಹೊನಬುರ್ಗ).— ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನನ್ನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದಂಥ ಶ್ರೀಮಾಚಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಅನುಮೋದಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲಿಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. obligatory duties of the taluk boards ಹಿಂದೆ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಇದ್ದುವು. ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಇದ್ದಿತ್ತೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಈಗ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಯೆಂದರೆ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳು ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಏನೇನು ಅನಾನುಕೂಲಗಳು ಆದುವೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹಿಂದೆ 1926-27ರಲ್ಲಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಬಾಲಿಷ್ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಇಪ್ಪೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವನ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ, ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಿರುವ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇವಲ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಡಿಸ್‌ಪೆನ್ಸರಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಡಾಕ್ಟರುಗಳ ಸಂಬಳಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಾಕಿ ಖರ್ಚುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರೇ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಂದೊಂದು ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ 1,200 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ವರೆಗೂ ಮೇಂಟೆನೆನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಿಡ್ ವೈಫ್ ಸಂಬಳ, ಕಂಪೌಂಡಿನನ್ಸ್ ಇವುಗಳ ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರೇ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಹೇಗೆ? ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ವರಮಾನ ಏನು? ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು-ಮೂರು ಡಿಸ್‌ಪೆನ್ಸರಿ

ಗಳು ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ವಹಿಸಿದರೆ ಅವರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ಅಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡು ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ? ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳು ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಾದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವಕ್ಕೆ ಇರುವ ಕೆಲವು ಪವರ್ಸ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅವು ತಮಗೆ ಇರುವ ವರಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಸಾರಿ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟು ಆಗ ತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೇ ಅಶಕ್ತವಾಗಿವೆ. ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಯೇ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಐದು-ಐದೂವರೆ ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಆದಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಇನ್ನೂ ನಿಂತಿವೆ. ಡಿವಿಜನಲ್ ಕಮೀಷನರ್ ನಮಗೆ ಫೈನಾನ್ಷಿಯಲ್ ಅಸಿಸ್ಟೆನ್ಸ್, ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಮುಂದೆ ' ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಅಮಟ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೆ ಕೇವಲ ಶೇಕಡ 20-30ರಂತೆ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡ್ಮಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚಿತವಾಗಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಸ್ಕೂಲುಗಳು—ಆಸ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಮೇಂಟನೆನ್ಸ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್, ರೋಡ್ಸ್ ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಬಾಕಿ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಆಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾದ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sir, the approach made by my friends sitting on the other side is a little different from my own. I agree that several of the District Boards are unable to pay their school teachers. Many of the teachers have come to me and said "Take away these schools to the management of Government so that we might be safe." They have also said "please arrange payment of our salary on the 1st of every month from Government." All these difficulties the Government are aware of. In spite of these difficulties, we want the Taluk Board to be effective and to take responsibility for all the developmental work including secondary education in the taluk. "If we entrust all these things to them, what about money? Without money if you give them power they will not work."—that is the only objection raised by my friends here. It should not be forgotten that in the section we say that they must make reasonable provision. For example, the Taluk Boards prepare Budgets and in the Budget they have to make mention of minor irrigation. We allot ten thousand rupees out of our normal revenue, from the Government by way of loan we expect ten thousand rupees or our Budget for the year for the purpose of minor irrigation would be Rs. 22,000 or Rs. 26,000; something like that. So our object is that ultimately the Taluk Board must be able to play an important role in the development of the taluk including minor irrigation, to the extent possible. We have simply said that they have to make reasonable provision. I use the word adnauseum because that is an important phrase. We do not say that they should bear the whole burden. We simply say "make reasonable provision in your Budget out of your own funds." It is not as if the Government will shirk all their responsibility.

1-30 P.M.

Even as it is, Government bears a major portion of these expenses. In the Government budget, Members will find that for several of these items, moneys are provided which would be placed at the disposal of the taluk board. We do not want any Government machinery to interfere in the management of the taluk board. We want the taluk boards to plan and execute their plans. We want them to take the initiative. We take the initiative in so far as the plan for the State is concerned. The Planning Commission approves of it and the Central Government provides assistance for us. So also here, the taluk board plans and then approaches the Government for necessary help. Government would, apart from the portion of the burden that they are now bearing, certainly help the taluk board by way of grants or loans in order to see that their plan expenditure is met. We are not going to starve them. We want them to learn to take responsibilities. We want that leadership should be built up from the village-level, at the taluk level and then we take up the responsibility for the whole State. With this object in view, we have introduced these provisions. Not that we expect them to build all the tanks. Government is

(SRI T. SUBRAMANYA)

there to build them, but they have to take the initiative; we do not want to take the initiative. I have to eat that which I digest. Another person should not push it down my throat. They know what is best for them. They must realise it. They must hereafter know what is best for them and act. They should not expect the Government to decide what is best for them. With this object in view we have introduced this provision. We will give them all help.

The next point on which I would have to dwell is about the district board high schools. So far as elementary education is concerned, the Education Minister has already announced the policy of the Government. I am one with him in saying that it is the primary duty of the Government to give primary education to children upto the ages between 13 and 14. The responsibility is that of the Government and Government will have to bear the burden. Whether we entrust it to the taluk board or the village panchayat or anybody else, to that extent help will have to be given by the Government. With regard to high schools, I agree with Hon'ble Members that the deplorable condition of these high schools has to be changed, if not today, atleast tomorrow, but we cannot wait for long. Many of the high-school teachers are in a miserable plight. They have all my sympathies, but the Government have not as yet taken a decision as to what should be done. We want to create non-official agencies to take these high-schools and we would give grants. We encourage the public to support it. But till then, we want to see that the present arrangement continues. If the present arrangement continues and if the taluk board is found incapable of maintaining, we will take action. Suppose there are five high-schools in a taluk, which were hitherto managed by the District Board and the responsibility for which would devolve on the taluk board. If the finances of the taluk board do not permit its management, do not think for a minute that we will sit with closed hands and do nothing. Government will have to go to their rescue.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Will the Minister accept an amendment in this clause which would add the words "that such assistance as Government may be pleased to make from time to time."

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Not necessary. Why should the Hon'ble Member distrust the Government? We are already giving them 75 per cent. The words suggested by the Hon'ble Member would not be necessary because the Government is already giving such assistance and they may increase it. They may make further arrangements. Therefore my humble submission is that these provisions are necessary for the development of the taluk boards into real self-governing institutions.

Sri M. Y. GHORPADE (Sandur).—Is the Hon'ble Minister aware that in Madras they are envisaging the giving of one rupee per head specifically for education, which would be kept as an education fund and they are to implement the compulsory education scheme? Why is that system not adopted here?

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—We take the responsibility. My friend has brought in Madras several times. I do not want to refer to a sister State. It should be remembered that Madras does not give, according to their present scheme, any contribution of land revenue to the village panchayat. They simply say: 'We give you a matching grant, matching the amount that you collect." Suppose a village panchayat collects Rs. 600, the Madras Government says that they would give another Rs. 600. But our scheme is that we give 30 per cent of the land revenue. It is a statutory provision. Next, we have taken up the responsibility for primary education, whether it costs us one rupee or twenty rupees. In Madras, for health, education and I suppose some other things, the amount spent per head is about Rs. 3.8, whereas here we spend Rs. 6.1. I have got the whole thing calculated. No

one should infer that the Mysore Government is behind other Governments in giving the necessary help to nation-building activities. We are giving as much and much more. Only the scheme is a little different.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—It is all a paper-statement.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I am responsible for the figures. I will have to hang my head in shame if I am wilfully to give wrong figures. I am giving these figures after due calculations have been made. I want to tell the Hon'ble Members that we have given sufficient funds for all nation-building activities.

There was another amendment to clause (3). We do not want them to construct. There was an amendment, I suppose, to reduce it to 10 or 20 per cent instead of the present 50 per cent. They are required only to make a reasonable provision. They are not required to meet the entire expenditure for construction. They will have to learn to construct.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—They will now begin to make a token provision of one rupee!

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Let them do it. We have powers to see that they increase it, if their funds permit. Therefore I plead that the clause should remain as it is.

I do not propose to accept Sri Kenchappa's amendment. If any new work is given to them, we have also said that Government shall pay for them. I do not also accept Sri Chamiah's amendment, because before the Government settles its policy, it cannot take over the management of all district board high schools. In regard to secondary schools, if a particular taluk board or village panchayat is starved for want of money, we are sure to provide for help out of some head from the Centre.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sri Mariappa will create a bottle-neck.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sri Muckannappa is always fond of saying that our Finance Minister creates bottlenecks. It is not so. In fact, I would like to give a compliment to him.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—No, not here. I can tell you that when we raised the land revenue assignment from 20 per cent to 30 per cent I had not even to discuss the matter with him, but he was very willing to raise it.

Sri M. Y. GHORPADE.—If you do not make the necessary financial provision, why should you include these as their obligatory functions? If these are included as obligatory functions, there is the danger of Government not undertaking these works saying that they are included in the obligatory functions for which sufficient provision is made.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—While calculating the amount to be assigned to the various local bodies we have taken care to see what is the amount we are spending today on those things. On that basis we have made assignments and they are sufficient, according to the Government to carry on the works now being carried on by Government in the taluks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

> '1. At the end of item (i) of sub-clause (1) the following words shall be added:
>
> "Or of the District Boards at the time this Act comes into force."
>
> 2. Item (iii) of sub-clause (1) shall be deleted, and the subsequent items shall be re-numbered.
>
> 3. In item (v) of sub-clause (1) the words "hospitals, dispensaries, veterinary hospitals," shall be deleted.
>
> 4. The following proviso shall be added after the existing proviso to sub-clause (1):
>
> "Provided also that it shall be the responsibilisy of Government to take over and maintain all the educational institutions under the control of the District and Panchayat Boards at the time this Act comes into force."'

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA (Channapatna).—Sir, I claim a division.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Yes, the bell will be rung for three minutes. (*The bell was rung for 3 minutes*).

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Those who are in favour will rise in their seats (34 *members rose in their seats*). Those who are against will rise in their seats. (*65 members rose in their seats*). The amendment is negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"In sub-clause (1), item (xvii) shall be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

'In item (iii), for the words and figures "50 acres" the words and figures "10 acres" shall be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"Clause 130, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 130, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 131.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:

'Item (a) (i) shall be deleted.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"Item (a) (i) shall be deleted."

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—130ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೆ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸದೆ ಇರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿರುವ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಕಡೆ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ನಡೆಸುವ ಶಾಲೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಬಳಗಳನ್ನೇ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳೂ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ ಹೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು ಜೀವನಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪ್ರೈಮರಿ ಶಾಲೆಯ ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಾಯರುಗಳಿಗೆ ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ಸಂಬಳವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವರ ಜೀವನಮಟ್ಟವನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅವರು ಮಕ್ಕಳಿಗೆಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ವಿಧ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಮಾಡಿಸಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಒತ್ತಾಯಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಮಾಡಿದೆವು. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಇದರ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯೇ ನಮಗೆ ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ನೂರು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ ಹತ್ತು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೂಡ ಕೊಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವವರ ತಲೆಗೆ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇರುವಂತೆ ತಿಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ನಾವು ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ; ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ತಾವು ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಸಹಿತ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಲ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ತಿರುಗಬೇಕು? ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ನಿಮ್ಮ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದೆಯೇ, ಅದರ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಏನು, ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಪಸು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯ ಎಂದು ಏನೋನ್ನೋ ಕಂಡಿಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಇಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲ ಆಗಿ ಸಾಲ ಮಂಜೂರಾಗುವುದರೊಳಗೆ ಆ ವರ್ಷ ಮುಗಿದು ಹೋಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಾಲ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾವಿರ ಕಂಡಿಷನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವ ವೇಳೆಗೆ ಆ ವರ್ಷವೇ ಮುಗಿದುಹೋಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ತಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಚರಂಡಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಆಗದೆ ಇರುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇರುವಾಗ, ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಸಾಲ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ, ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ವರ್ಷಗಳಾದರೂ ಕೊಡದೆ ಇರುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಿವೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬೇರೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗ ಎಂದು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಆಯಾ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗತಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿರುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಮಾಡಿ, ಹಣ ಸಾಲದೆ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದುದೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಸಾಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಯಾವುದೂ ಮನೂವೆಯಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಬಿಡಬಹುದು. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಕಡೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಇರಬಹುದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಕಮ್ಯುನಿಸ್ಟರು ಇರಬಹುದು ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಇಪ್ಪೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅಪಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜನತೆಯ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಲು ಶಕ್ತರಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋಗುವಂತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಕೂಲನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಒಂದು ರಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಕಷ್ಟಕರವಾದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಒದಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಾಗುವಷ್ಟು ಹಣವಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಈ ಸರಕಾರ ಇರಬಹುದು ನಾಳೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಸರಕಾರ ಬರಬಹುದು. ನಿಮ್ಮನ್ನೇ ಮಂತ್ರಿ ಮಂಡಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂತ್ರಿಯಾಗಿ ಇಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ? ನಾಳೆ ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬರು ಬರಬಹುದು. ಯಾರದ್ದೂ ಖಾತರಿಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ ಕಾರಣ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವಾಗಲೇ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಅನ್ಯಾಯವೂ ಆಗದಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕೇರಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನ ಸರಕಾರ ವಿದ್ದಾಗ ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಗಲೇ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಸ್ಥಾನಮಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಅದು "ಕಂಟಿನ್ಯೂ" ಆಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಸರಕಾರ ಎಷ್ಟು ಸಾಲವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಎಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಜಾ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. Discretionary ಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಾಳೆ ನಾನು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ನಾದರೆ ಅಥವಾ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರಾದರೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸರಕಾರ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಅಥವಾ ನಾಳೆ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರೇ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ನರಾಗಿ ಎಂದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿರುವ ತುರವೇಕೆರೆಯ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರು ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ನರಾಗಿ ಬಂದರೆ ಆಗ ಸರಕಾರ ಅವರ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯವರು ಬಂದರೆಂದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ನಾನಾಗಲಿ ನೀವಾಗಲಿ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ನರಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಗಳು ಆಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವಾಗಬಾರದು. ಸರಕಾರ ಗ್ರಾಂಟಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಲಿ, ಸಾಲವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಸುಲಲಿತವಾಗಿ ಆಗುವಂತೆ ಈಗಿರುವ ಕಾನೂನಿನಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲಿರುವ 131ನೇ ಕ್ಲಾಸು (ಎ)ಗೆ ತಂದಿರುವ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—So far as the present amendment to clause 131 (a) (i) is concerned, I feel I should support it not on the grounds that have already been stated by the mover, but I feel that I should like to have some explanation from the Minister who is piloting this Bill. So far as primary education is concerned, it is the primary duty of the Government to maintain and conduct primary education and in the Bombay area primary education is run by the district local boards with the help of the Government. Perhaps I presume that this Government will bring some measure in order to unify the law so far as primary education is concerned. Now if this contribution towards the establishment and running of institutions imparting primary education, is one of the duties of these taluk boards, I think it will be overlapping of the authorities concerned. There is the Government; there is the District Board and also there would be the Taluk Board. Further, there are municipalities and grama panchayats also who have been given similar powers so far as education is concerned. So I should like to have explanation from the Minister as to how this contribution for primary education is to be charged to these local boards or taluk boards. If Government is to run primary education on their own responsibility, then why should these taluk boards be made responsible for running the schools? It may be a few schools, but I do not understand when we are going to have primary education made compulsory at the expense of the Government, why should the taluk boards be made to contribute for the running of these schools? Considering the financial position of the Taluk Boards, the duties as enunciated in clause 130 are so numerous that they will not be in a position to have any such contribution either for primary or secondary education at all. There are so many taluks where the assessment is too low, especially the malnad area taluk or jungle area taluk where the assessment is low and I am afraid that in these taluks even the administrative staff cannot be run by the taluk boards at all. Further more, if this contribution for primary education is incurred under this Act, Government will try to extract some money from the taluk boards who have already been charged with so many duties under the last clause.

Secondly, about secondary education I do not understand how secondary education can be saddled on this body because it is a very expensive thing and I do not think it is the intention of the Government that these bodies are to run secondary education or to pay something for that. I do not understand why these provisions have been made here. I should like to

(SRI V. S. PATIL)

have a clear explanation from the Minister.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The Balwantrai Mehta Committee went into the question and they felt that primary education should be the responsibility of a central agency and the best central agency for efficient discharge of constitutional obligation is the Government. There is the constitutional obligation. I do not see how any other statutory body can be made responsible for this. Secondly, in item (ii) of sub-clause (1), it is stated as obligatory function: "construction, repair and maintenance of Government primary school buildings". So when that is already there, what is possibly contemplated here is payment of salaries of teachers and other expenditure apart from construction, maintenance, etc. So this means an additional expenditure for an item which is really the function of the State. As I said in relation to village panchayats, there is confusion of function. It means that the division of State function that can be assigned to local bodies, that can be assigned to the Central Government is already lost sight of and it appears that one juts into the other and it is not proper.

2 P.M.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sir, my friends seem to have missed that this is only a discretionary power; they may or they may not contribute. This provision only enables a Taluk Board, if it has sufficient funds, to make contribution towards some primary school or secondary school. The question is put to me as to the necessity of this provision because it is the duty of the Government to undertake the responsibility of imparting primary education. I envisage an instance where the Government will not impart primary education to a particular section of people if they do not come in sufficient numbers. Suppose there is a small village or a big town in a village panchayat area or Taluk Board, where there are not a sufficient number of boys to attend a school opened by the Government taught in the regional languages. Suppose there are Telugu boys in a village and only 10 to 12 boys attend the School, then the Government cannot open a primary school there unless there are in sufficient number. So also in Marathi area, unless they come in sufficient number, Government will not be obliged to op n a school. In such circumstances, if a private individual takes the responsibility of imparting primary or secondary education to a class of people, nothing should prevent the Taluk Board if its funds permit, from giving them some sort of help by way of contribution. And for that if the funds permit, If they so desire; this is purely an enabling clause. I do not see any necessity for our friends to feel so much about it. I oppose the amendment, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That item (a) (i) shall be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Even though there are no amendments so far as the remaining sub-clauses of clause 131 are concerned, I would like to speak on sub-clause (iii), The sub-clause (iii) reads thus:—

"(iii) encourage and develop co-operative societies in the taluk:"

It is wellknown, Sir, that in the last Congress Session at Nagpur, the Congress has passed a resolution to have co-operative farming or co-operative farming societies in each and every village and there is a great controversy throughout the nation as to whether this will be a success or not; and the Congress High Command, and even in today's papers, the Congress President was pleased to say that at any cost they were going to have co-operative societies so far as farming was concerned. And when this is the attitude and basic principle adopted by the Congress, I do not understand why this clause has not been taken up or included in the previous one, that is, clause 130: obligatory duties. If it is

kept as a discretionary measure, it means that the present Government does not desire to have these co-operative farming or co-operative societies so far as agriculture is concerned. I may be allowed to say that the Government is completely on the rightist side of the Congress Party and not following the decisions that have been passed in the last session. I would like to say a few words regarding their position so far as co-operative farming is concerned.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—The Government is wholeheartedly behind the resolution of Nagpur session with regard to the formation of service co-operative societies and co-operative farming. We are not shirking it. From the top-most breadth of our voice, we have declared that we will have service co-operative societies established in every group of village within three years. Subsequent to three years, without using any compulsion such of those members who want to have a joint cultivation and the co-operative system, they will be encouraged by means of persuasion, no compulsion anywhere. Therefore here the sub-clause does not indicate our association with the rightist of the Congress as my hon'ble friend says. This Government asserts itself that they will follow the resolution passed at Nagpur by the All India Congress Committee. This section is there for the village panchayats to encourage and develop co-operative societies. It does not make it incumbent upon the village panchayats themselves to organise co-operative societies, or the Taluk Board to organise or start co-operative farming. There is a different department for that purpose, and therefore, we have included it in the discretionary powers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 131 do stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 131 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clauses 132 to 135 both inclusive do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 132 to 135 were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 136.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA (Hiriyur).—I beg to move:

"That sub-clause (1) of clause 136 shall be deleted."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That sub-clause (1) of clause 136 shall be deleted."

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—I pray that it may be deleted.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I oppose it, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That sub-clause (1) of clause 136 shall be deleted."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 136 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 136 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clauses 137 to 161 both inclusive do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 137 to 161 were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 162.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—I beg to move:

"The following items shall be inserted before the existing item

(SRI K. KENCHAPPA)

(i) and the subsequent items shall be renumbered :—

"(*i*) The balance of District, Taluk and rural development fund available as on 1-1-52 and during subsequent years unassigned as per provisions of section 105 of the Mysore Act No. IV 1952.

(*ii*) All amounts to be sanctioned and allotted to :

(*a*) The State Adult Education Committee;
(*b*) The State Samskrutiprachar;
(*c*) Rural Development Works ;
(*d*) For creating drinking water facilities ;
(*e*) Social Welfare Works ;
(*f*) Propaganda ;
(*g*) Sevadal ;
(*h*) Development of Cottage Industries, handicrafts, Khadi and propaganda for such works ;
(*i*) Vanamahotsava ;
(*j*) Improvement, restoration and construction of minor irrigation tanks ;
(*k*) Education Cess ;
(*l*) Malnad dry area and neglected and uncared for parts development fund ;
(*m*) Amounts sanctioned for N.E.S. and C.D. Blocks ;
(*n*) Amounts sanctioned for scheduled castes amelioration work and development of their education and economic conditions etc ;
(*o*) The amounts sanctioned for manufacture of better manure and their distribution and manurepits including composts, distribution of seeds, model farms ;
(*p*) The amounts sanctioned for conferences of any kind ;
(*q*) Schemes for development of rural housing."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

'The following items shall be inserted before the existing item (*i*) and the subsequent items shall be renumbered:—

"(*i*) The balance of District, Taluk and Rural Development Fund available as on 1-1-52 and during subsequent years unassigned as per provisions of Section 105 of the Mysore Act No. IV of 1952.

(*ii*) All amounts to be sanctioned and allotted to :

(*a*) The State Adult Education Committee,
(*b*) The State Samskrutiprachar ;
(*c*) Rural development works ;
(*d*) For creating drinking water facilities ;
(*e*) Social Welfare Works ;
(*f*) Propaganda ;
(*g*) Sevadal ;
(*h*) Development of Cottage Industries, handicrafts, Khadi and propaganda for such works ;
(*i*) Vanamahotsava ;
(*j*) Improvement, restoration and construction of minor irrigation tanks ;
(*k*) Education Cess ;
(*l*) Malnad dry area and neglected and uncared for parts development fund ;
(*m*) Amounts sanctioned for N. E.S. and C.D. Blocks ;
(*n*) Amounts sanctioned for scheduled castes amelioration work and development of their education and economic conditions, etc ;
(*o*) The amounts sanctioned for manufacture of better manure and their distribution and manurepits including composts, distribution of seeds, model farms ;
(*p*) The amounts sanctioned for conferences of any kind ;
(*q*) Schemes for development of rural housing.'"

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈಗ ಕಾಲ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೊತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಹೇಳುವುದು ಕಷ್ಟ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ನಚಿವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳ ಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಎಂದರೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಅನಕ್ಕವಹಿಸಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನೂಕ್ತ ಎನ್ನುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಅವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸ ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಎಂದು. ಆದ್ದ

ರಿಂದ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಕೆಲಸ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದೆ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇಂತಿಂಥಾ ಬಾಬಿನಿಂದ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಬರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ನಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೀನಲಾಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಡುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳು ತಮಗೆ ವಹಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುವ ಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಮತ್ತು ಒಂದು ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಆ ದುಡ್ಡನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಎನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ತಾನೇ ಹೇಳಿದರು, ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳ ಮೂಲಕವೇ ನಡೆಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು. ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿದ ಪೊಬಲಗು ಮೀನಲಾಗಿಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ದೇಶದ ಯಾವ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಖರ್ಚು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ದುಡ್ಡು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾಡುವ ಮೂಲಕ ಅವರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಜಾಗ್ರತೆ ಸಫಲ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sri Kenchappa referred to the balance available under Education cess. I am only taking it as an illustration. So far as 162 is concerned, this amount is not to be credited to the fund of the Taluk Board. I do not see the reason why it should not be done. If you refer to clause 243 of the Bill, there is a provision that the Government shall levy an education cess at a rate of seven naye paise in the rupee. It refers only to the Bombay area. The fund available under education cess in so far as Bombay Area is concerned is made part of the Taluk Board Fund. With regard to old Mysore area, there is already education cess; in Hyderabad area, it was not there. In Madras area it is there. So far as these areas are concerned, I do not see any reason why they should not come into Taluk Board Fund. The second point on which I want clarification in relation to this matter is that in some of the integrated areas, collection charges of taxes were not included. That is, the entire cess was made over; in some old Mysore area, it was cess minus collection charges. I would like to know whether 162(*ii*) includes the expenditure on account of collection or whether it would exclude expenditure on account of collection. I support the amendment.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I oppose the amendment. With regard to sub-clause (*ii*), he wants the moneys of all the departments to be given over. Is it ever possible? With regard to sub-clause (*i*), any amount that is due to the District Boards under the Village Panchayats and District Boards Act of Mysore existing hitherto will be the District Boards Fund and that will be added on to the Taluk Board Fund. There is no necessity to make a special provision for it. With regard to education cess, in the Bombay area it was due to the Local Education Board. Here, since the Government are now taking all the responsibility, it will go to Government. We have made an exception with regard to Bombay area and I am unable to accept any of these amendments.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

'That the following items shall be inserted before the existing item (*i*) and the subsequent items shall be renumbered:—

"(*i*) the balance of District, Taluk and Rural Development Fund available on 1-1-52 and during subsequent years unassigned as per provisions of Section 105 of the Mysore Act No. IV of 1952;

(*ii*) All amounts to be sanctioned and allotted to:

(*a*) The State Adult Education Committee;
(*b*) The State Samskrutiprachar;
(*c*) Rural development works;
(*d*) For creating drinking water facilities;
(*e*) Social Welfare Works;
(*f*) Propaganda;
(*g*) Sevadal;
(*h*) Development of Cottage Industries, Handicrafts, Khadi and propaganda for such works;
(*i*) Vanamahotsava;
(*j*) Improvement, restoration and construction of minor irrigation tanks,
(*k*) Education Cess;

(MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER)

(*l*) Malnad dry area and neglected and uncared for parts development fund;

(*m*) Amounts sanctioned for N. E.S. and C.D. Blocks;

(*n*) Amounts sanctioned for scheduled castes amelioration work and development of their education and economic conditions, etc.

(*o*) The amounts sanctioned for manufacture of better manure and their distribution and manure-pits including composts, distribution of seeds, model farms;

(*p*) The amounts sanctioned for conferences of any kind;

(*q*) Schemes for development of rural housing.''

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

''That clause 162 stand part of the Bill.''

The motion was adopted.

Clause 162 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

''That clauses 163 and 164 stand part of the Bill.''

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 163 and 164 were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 165.

Sri M. Y. GHORPADE.—I beg to move:

''That for sub-clauses (1), (2) and (3) the following sub-clauses shall be substituted:—

(*i*) The Government shall make annually a grant to every taluk board of an amount equal to 5 per cent of its land revenue.

(*ii*) The Government shall also assign to each Taluk Board 10 per cent of the land revenue of the State distributed on the basis of rural population.

(*iii*) The Government shall assign to each Taluk Board 5 per cent of the land revenue of the State to be distributed to different Taluk Board in the proportion of their areas.

(*iv*) The Government shall assign to Taluk Boards 5 per cent of the land revenue of the State on the basis of relative backwardness to be determined according to rules made in this behalf.''

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 165. Amendment moved:

''That for sub-clauses (1), (2) and (3) the following sub-clauses shall be substituted:—

(*i*) The Government shall make annually a grant to every taluk board of an amount equal to 5 per cent of its land revenue.

(*ii*) The Government shall also assign to each Taluk Board 10 per cent of the land revenue of the State distributed on the basis of rural population.

(*iii*) The Government shall assign to each Taluk Board 5 per cent of the land revenue of the State to be distributed to different Taluk Board in the proportion of their areas.

(*iv*) The Government shall assign to Taluk Boards 5 per cent of the land revenue of the State on the basis of relative backwardness to be determined according to rules made in this behalf.''

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—I do not move my amendments.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE (Sirsi).—I beg to move:

''That after sub clause (3) the following sub-clause shall be added:

(4) In addition to the amounts granted and assigned under sub-clauses (1) and (2) the Government

shall make annually a grant to every Taluk Board of an amount equal to 15 per cent of the forest revenue collections of the taluk provided the forest area of the district in which the said Taluk Board is situated exceeds 50 per cent of the total area. The amounts so granted shall be allotted by the Taluk Board to the Village Panchayats within the jurisdiction of the taluk in such manner as may be prescribed.

Existing sub-clause (4) shall be re-numbered as sub-clause (5) and sub-clause (5) be re-numbered as sub-clause (6).

In the present sub-clause (5) for the words, figures and brackets 'sub-sections (1), (2) and (4)' the words, figures and brackets 'sub-section (1), (2), (4) and (5)' shall be substituted."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That after sub-clause (3) the following sub-clause shall be added :

"(4) In addition to the amounts granted and assigned under sub-clauses (1) and (2) the Government shall make annually a grant to every Taluk Board of an amount equal to 15 per cent of the forest revenue collections of the taluk provided the forest area of the district in which the said Taluk Board is situated exceeds 50 per cent of the total area. The amounts so granted shall be allotted by the Taluk Board to the Village Panchayats within the jurisdiction of the taluk in such manner as may be prescribed.

Existing sub-clause (4) shall be renumbered as sub-clause (5) and sub-clause (5) be renumbered as sub-clause (6).

In the present sub-clause (5) for the words, figures and brackets "sub-sections (1), (2) and (4)" the words, figures and brackets "sub-sections (1), (2), (4) and (5)" shall be substituted."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 165. There are amendments by Sri M. R. Patil and others.

Sri M. R. PATIL (Hubli).—I am not moving the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is an amendment by Sri S. D. Kothavale. The Hon'ble Member is not present. Next, Sri M. C. Narasimhan may move his amendment.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I beg to move :

"That in sub-clause (2) for the words 'being such...time direct' the words, 'being in the same ratio as the population of the Taluk bears to the population of the State' shall be substituted."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

"That in sub-clause (2) for the words 'being such...time direct' the words, 'being in the same ratio as the population of the Taluk bears to the population of the State' shall be substituted."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is an amendment by Sri E. Narayana Gowda.

Sri E. NARAYANA GOWDA (Bangarpet).—I beg to move :

'That in sub-clause (2) the following words shall be added at the end :

"On the recommendations of the District Development Council".'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved :

'That in sub-clause (2) the following words shall be added at the end :

"On the recommendations of the District Development Council".'

Sri M. Y. GHORPADE.—The allocation of grants should not be based only upon land revenue. Government should also take into account the population, area and backwardness. In view of the shortness of time, I will just confine myself to a few remarks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Sri Ghorpade has got an amendment.

Sri M. Y. GHORPADE.—I beg to move:

"That for sub-clauses (1), (2) and (3) the following sub-clauses shall be substituted:

(*i*) The Government shall make annually a grant to every taluk board of an amount equal to 5 per cent of its land revenue;

(*ii*) The Government shall also assign to each Taluk Board 10 per cent of the land revenue of the State distributed on the basis of rural population;

(*iii*) The Government shall assign to each Taluk Board 5 per cent of the land revenue of the State to be distributed to different Taluk Boards in the proportion of their areas.;

(*iv*) The Government shall assign to Taluk Boards 5 per cent of the land revenue of the State on the basis of relative backwardness to be determined according to rules made in this behalf."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"That for sub-clauses (1), (2) and (3) the following sub-clauses shall be substituted.—

(*i*) The Government shall make annually a grant to every taluk board of an amount equal to 5 per cent of its land revenue;

(*ii*) The Government shall also assign to each Taluk Board 10 per cent of the land revenue of the State distributed on the basis of rural population;

(*iii*) The Government shall assign to each Taluk Board 5 per cent of the land revenue of the State to be distributed to different Taluk Boards in the proportion of their areas.

(*iv*) The Government shall assign to Taluk Boards 5 per cent of the land revenue of the State on the basis of relative backwardness to be determined according to rules made in this behalf."

†Sri M. Y. GHORPADE.—In view of the shortness of time I will just confine myself to a few remarks. I feel constrained to move this amendment because in a socialistic pattern of society in which you believe, in the fundamentals of Local Self-Government finance, in the fundamentals of the legality of the society where you believe in giving in uniform social services, I do not understand how land revenue could be taken as the sole basis for allocating grants. As an example as to what happens, just now we were calculating what each panchayat gets. One will get about Rs. 50,000 as thirty per cent of the land revenue if it is Rs. 2 lakhs, whereas panchayats in non-irrigated areas will get Rs. 500. Just compare Rs. 50,000 with Rs. 500. This is the magnitude of disparity that will result if you consider each village or village panchayat as a separate kingdom by itself with its own finances and this will be the result if you take the land revenue resources. If you see the disparity in the Taluk Board finances and panchayat finances the ratio will be 1:6. I am fully convinced that the countryside, when the poor financial implication is put into practice, will not tolerate a situation like this. It is highly inequitable because land revenue is not a local cess; it is a part of the general revenues that must be shared on an equitable basis. If we accept the provision in the Bill as it stands, it means—to give an analogy it is like a rich man saying that "I will pay all the taxes and that the amount must be spent within my compound." I cannot understand how disparity in the development is going to be tolerated. It is not a small disparity. Therefore I beg to submit that not only the land revenue, but the population, and the relative backwardness should be taken into account with regard to each panchayat. Even now it is not too late. After all the provision for allocation of finances to each panchayat has been passed and I have just now shown what discrimination it will result in. At least in allocating finances to Taluk Boards some attempt can be made on progressive principles, so that the harm

or inequity done by clause 78 may to some extent get reduced by more progressive principles being applied to Taluk Boards. Therefore what I suggest is that about 10 per cent of the State land revenue should be distributed to Taluk Boards on the basis of population, 5 per cent on the basis of the area, 5 per cent on the basis of backwardness and 5 per cent on land revenue. No doubt I do not outright rule out that land revenue should, to some extent, be taken into consideration. That is because, as pointed out by some friends in the House, the incidence of land revenue is not quite the same in all parts of the State and that is the valid reason why land revenue should be taken into consideration to some extent. There is no reason whatever to take land revenue into consideration when standardised land revenue incidence is going to take place within the next two or three years. But I cannot understand a situation where out of 60 per cent of the land revenue it has been suggested for a panchayat and for Taluk Boards 50 per cent as the sole basis. But I can understand if a district was taken as a unit and if you say that the land revenue should be taken as the basis and distributed to several taluks on progressive principles, that is on the basis of population, backwardness of the area, and so on. I could have also understood if you had suggested that the entire State should be divided into zones depending on the incidence of land revenue. Supposing land revenue is high in Hyderabad area ; it could be considered as another zone and within that zone you could have applied the principle of distribution on progressive lines. Today that has not been done ; not even a taluk has been taken as a unit.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The House will now adjourn and meet again after half an hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Thirty Minutes past Two of the Clock and re-assembled at Three of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

SRI M. Y. GHORPADE.—Sir, I wish to submit that if this provision is passed as it stands today in the bill, certain areas getting lavish grants will get used to it and it will become difficult for the Government to reduce or or set it right or to give grants on a scientific or egalitarian principle. It will become a habit and people would resent changes. People do not like to give up something which they have got. Therefore, this amendment must be given its fullest consideration.

What surprises me is that in the original bill 15 per cent was to have been given on land revenue basis and 10 per cent was discretionary. Subsequently it became 20 per cent on land revenue and 5 per cent discretionary. Now we get 30 per cent based on land revenue and 5 per cent discretionary. The formula has become progressively inequitable. Everytime it was changed it was for the worse. This is so in spite of the categorical assurance contained in the Taxation Enquiry Committee. When the Orissa Government proposed to give the entire land revenue to panchayats and taluk boards on the basis solely of land revenue, the committee categorically pointed out that this could not be done because it would result in severe inequalities and disappointment and the non-irrigated areas would suffer to a very great extent. This is not only stated by the Taxation Enquiry Committee but this has also been envisaged by the Balwant Rai Mehta Committee, upon which this bill is based. Therefore, I cannot understand how the staggering differences in the land revenues of panchayat—it is anything between Rs. 500 and Rs. 50,000—how this colossal gulf is going to be bridged. The Hon'ble Minister may argue that 5 per cent has been set aside as a discretionary grant. This is a flea-bite because the total land revenue set aside is 60 per cent out of which 10 per cent has been set aside as discretionary and that too it has not been specifically stated that it will be used for equalising or will be used only for backward areas. I do not see how it will be worked. It will be full of

(SRI M. Y. GHORPADE)

administrative difficulties. I do not see how the Government from Bangalore would be able to judge the conditions of the individual panchayats in this vast State. In any case, out of 60 per cent, 50 per cent is now being solely on land revenue basis. Actually, if we take into account the assignment, it will come to another 20 per cent. That means out of a total of 80 per cent of land revenue, 70 per cent will be given exclusively on land revenue basis. It amounts to almost saying that the entire land revenue be given on land revenue basis, in spite of the specific assurance given by the Taxation Enquiry Committee.

Sir, I also feel that at least the minimum requirements of establishment should have been taken into account. If the present arrangement is agreed to, I am convinced that a vast majority of panchayats and many taluk boards will not be able to meet even their establishment charges. So, in giving 30 per cent, it might have been ensured that each panchayat is given the minimum for at least establishment charges, so that it could afford to put up a board outside its premises to announce the name of the panchayat.

I would once again reiterate that population, land revenue, area and backwardness must be taken into account because in all similar legislation framed in our country, the population criterion has been taken into account in one form or another. For instance, in Madras, the population criterion is 50 per cent, of the total allotment. They have taken into account the mileage of roads, backwardness and land revenue. Therefore, I suggest that some thougt be given to this. Otherwise, I am convinced that it will result in tremendous frustration and terrible disillufionment in the rural areas. The result would be that all the enthusiasm that we want to generate for the proper functioning of local self-governing institutions will be killed in the initial stoge itself and that is the last thing that we want to do. I feel we would be doing great disservice to the cause of local self-governing institutions in the State. In conclusion I am only reminded what Jesus Christ has said in the Bible:

"To him who has not, more shall be given . . . ."

If this measure is to be claimed as progressive, something will have to be done to make the bill more equitable as well as egalitarian. If we are to enthuse the people and make them more energetic, some of the provisions which would promote a feeling of inequitability, frustration and dissatisfaction should go.

†SRI RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE :—Sir, there cannot be two opinions about the necessity of providing adequate finances to the village panchayat and taluk boards. By introducing this amendment, I have tried to point out that the percentage which has been reserved for distribution to village panchayats and taluk boards will not result in equal benefit to all areas. There are certain districts in our State in which vast areas of land are forests. For example, in North Kanara, more than 82 per cent of the district is forest area. The same is the case with Shimoga, Chickmagalur, Coorg and South Kanara and parts of other districts also. Now when we distribute solely on the basis of land revenue collected from each district or taluk, the finances that are available for taluk boards will be too meagre, wherever forest area is large. Therefore, I have suggested that in such districts where forest area is 50 per cent and more of the total area, the forest revenue should also be distributed to the taluk boards. I want to impress upon the House by giving one or two examples. At present the total land revenue position is as follows:

	Rs.
North Kanara ...	9 lakhs
South Kanara ...	23 ,,
Dharwar ...	38 ,,
Bijapur ...	21 ,,

It is quite evident from this that in North Kanara where the forest area is vast, the land revenue is very meagre. If only 30 per cent of the

land revenue is to be allotted to the taluk board, the funds available to the taluk board and the village panchayats there will be very inadequate and will not be sufficient even to maintain the office.

In this connection, I also want to point out that the people of these forest districts have the misfortune of having all disadvantages and no advantage of the forest area. They are exposed to all calamities and difficulties and they are not given any benefit out of the forest revenues. It was after long agitation that the erstwhile Bombay Government decided to give 2 per cent of the net forest revenue to the District Local Board and that came to roughly Rs. 2 lakhs. I have suggested in this amendment that at least 5 per cent of the net forest revenue should be earmarked for distribution to the various taluk boards and village panchayats in such districts where the forest area exceeds 50 per cent of the area. To quote only one example, in Supa the forest area is about 95 per cent and there are hardly 45 villages there. No village can have its own panchayat because the population is much less. So a group of villages will have a panchayat. As the distance between each village is considerable, the amount actually required by them will be much more than in the maidan area. So unless adequate funds are made available to them, we will not be doing justice to them.

I will support my argument by quoting the road mileage also. The road mileage of these districts is as under:

Bidar	370	7.8 per square mile.
Belgaum	1261	
Bijapur	900 & odd	
Dharwar	1100 & odd	
North Kanara	1225	

It is quite clear from this that we have to maintain a large mileage of roads also and so the funds required for all these purposes will be actually more as compared to the other areas. So I urge on the Government to accept this amendment.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, while considering this clause there are two aspects to be borne in mind. One is the inadequacy of the land revenue assignment. It is true that any amount of revenue assigned to the taluk board or the village panchayats will always be argued as inadequate. So I am not making that argument, but I want to say that looking at it from the point of view of a reasonable allocation this apportionment cannot be justified. I would like to be convinced that the apportionment of land revenue under clause 165 will help to improve the finances to such a degree that the finances that they will get will be at least equal to what they were getting formerly. By virtue of this clause 165 you will be actually reducing the total available receipts at the disposal of the district boards and taluk boards. Since taluk board figures are not available, I will take only the figures of district boards and that will give a fair idea of what will happen under the new dispensation. Before quoting the figures I want to say that the revenues of the taluk board are made up of levy of local taxes and duty of transfer of property. These are the only two items of revenue. If you compare this with the position as it obtained in the old Bombay Local Boards Act or the Mysore Village Panchayats and District Boards Act or the Madras Act, several items of taxation which were available to the District Boards are missing from this. For instance, in the Madras area property tax, tax on houses and entertainment tax were all available; in the old Mysore area certain more items of taxation under sections 105, 106 and 107 of the old Mysore Act were available. For instance, under section 106 (3) one-seventh of the excise revenue was available in the old Mysore area. In addition they were also getting other taxes like vehicle tax, immoveable property tax, etc. Now, none of these items are available to them under the new dispensation. So by virtue of this Bill we have deprived the local boards and the taluk boards of these receipts. This applies even to the Bombay area. If you calculate on the basis of this Bill, under clauses 163 and 165 the

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

total available resources will be roughly like this: I have taken into account only 25 per cent of the total land revenue and I have not taken into account the 5 per cent reserved for discretionary grant. I am prepared to say, for the sake of argument that even this 5 per cent will be allocated equally. Even then what will happen is this. Under the new dispensation on the basis of the land revenue and the cess for 1956-57 Belgaum will get Rs. 13.45 lakhs whereas in 1951-52 Belgaum was actually getting Rs. 18.94 lakhs. The difference is nearly Rs. 6 lakhs in Belgaum. Bijapur will get Rs. 10.45 lakhs where it was getting Rs. 15.03 lakhs under the old Bombay Local Boards Act, the difference being Rs. 5 lakhs. Dharwar will get Rs. 20.05 lakhs where it was actually getting Rs. 24.90 lakhs. Perhaps the difference in the case of Dharwar is not much, but in North Kanara the situation is really worse. North Kanara will get under this Bill Rs. 3 lakhs whereas it was entitled to get under the old dispensation Rs. 7.23 lakhs, the shortfall being of the order of half the total revenue available.

The only districts that will probably get considerable benefit would be the so-called backward districts of Gulbarga, Raichur and Bidar. Because even in 1953-54 or 1954-55 Gulbarga was entitled to 2·67, Raichur 2·33 and Bidar 1·93, but under the present dispensation, Raichur gets 10·89, Gulbarga 17·61 and Bidar 8·12. I am giving figures to show what an amount of disparity there is between the existing provision and what was available in terms of the old Act. Let us not talk of socialism, equity, justice and fair play. Are those areas not entitled to get at least what they were entitled to formerly. At least if there has been a clause to make good the possible loss, I could have understood it. There are similar saving clauses provided in all the Bills, but here in this Bill you don't find any such saving clause. The Bombay Karnatak areas are likely to lose. Some of the learned members were arguing that it should be assigned in terms of land revenue. If you adopt that, those areas are going to suffer. There is another equity in this matter.

Sri B. V. DESAI (Gangavathi).—In Hyderabad area the percentage of allotment to panchayats was only 15 per cent and that too it was on paper. So many panchayats were not given even 10 per cent. In actual fact, the figures that you have quoted, I think, are misleading.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—This is only from the District Board figure.

Sri B. V. DESAI.—It is only pertaining to 8 per cent or 10 per cent or 15 per cent, but actually it will be more than that. Because it is allotted 30 per cent.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I admit that these are the only three districts which are likely to benefit.

Sri B. V. DESAI.—At the time of having uniform laws some have to be benefited and some have to lose.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am not for a moment suggesting that those areas should not be given this benefit. On the other hand, I am asking that it must be raised.

Sri B. V. DESAI.—Another important reason why those areas get more is this. It is because of the fact that the incidence of land revenue is somewhat more, compared to Bombay and Mysore. That is why they get slightly more.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The argument that it is related to land revenue incidence is not correct when it comes to the taluk level. It is all right when it comes to village level, because the land revenue incidence is 1·67 for Bidar which gets Rs. 82,000 in terms of 20 per cent remission of land revenue whereas Kolar which gets land revenue assessment of 2·67 is not entitled to get even Rs. 35,000 by way of remission of land revenue. So it is not so simple and it is much more complicated. Several factors have to be taken into account. I am only giving figures to show that the assignment of land revenue as contemplated in section 165 is neither based on equity, nor on social

justice, nor based on the needs of the locality.

Coming to the next point, my difficulty is about sub-section (2) in relation to panchayats; that is discretionary grant vested in the Government, namely 5 per cent. It is not clear on what basis they are going to assign this revenue. It should be based either on backwardness or on population. So far as backwardness is concerned, my friend Mr. Ghorpade was trying to quote Madras. Section 107 definitely lays down that the assignment of certain sums must be based on the total road mileage available in a district in proportion to the total road mileage. The whole State is to be taken into account. That is the equitable and rational principle which any same Government would take into account.

In the matter of grant-in-aid, even art. 280 of the Constitution lays down what principles are to be taken into account. When that is accepted, I do not see any reason why this Government should not accept the same principle *vis-a-vis* the District Board or the Village Panchayat. How can any sane Government refuse to adopt this equitable principle? As I have already submitted, certain taxes are not available to the Taluk Board, which were also previously available. Lastly, another argument which may be advanced is this. Some area fortunately, rightly or wrongly, is a little more advanced. For example, take old Mysore area; it is a little more advanced in terms of road mileage. The Madras area is a little more advanced in regard to the maintenance of hospitals and educational institutions. But this alone can not be used as a yardstick to say "Let us equalise it. Some areas which are advanced will have to forego for the purpose of development." That argument does not appear to be correct. I can only say that I support this amendment and I want the Government at least to accept that the land revenue assignment should be 30 per cent as in the case of village panchayats.

ಶ್ರೀ ಇ. ನಾರಾಯಣಗೌಡ.—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, 165 ನೆಯ ಪೆಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮಾನ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ವಿಲೇಜು ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಆಡಳಿತ ಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಮೂವತ್ತ್ರರಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇರೀತಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಮೂವತ್ತ್ರರಷ್ಟು ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂವನ್ನೂ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ವಿನಂತಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I am afraid the way we are discussing this, it is not likely that before the next two minutes we will be able to finish the discussion of the important clauses. So I propose that you extend the consideration of this Bill by another hour by virtue of the powers vested in you because particularly some more clauses of the Bill are very important, namely 187, 188 and two or three other clauses. I am afraid if the Bill is passed without a discussion on the important aspects, it would be rather hard. I request the Chair to be pleased to extend the time by another hour so that it might facilitate discussion on the more important clauses.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—At the rate at which we are going, I am afraid we cannot finish. If the House agrees, I have no objection to extend the consideration of the Bill by another hour.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—What about other Bills, namely the Mysore Rent Control Bill and the Madras District Boards (Mysore Amendment) Bill?

3-30 P.M.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The rate at which we are going on with the debate, I am afraid, we cannot finish the Bill. If the House agrees to sit longer, I have no objection.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Government have no objection to continue the discussion till 4-30 P.M. today, for an hour more and at 4-30, we may take the other Bills put down on the order paper.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—So, we will go on with the Bill upto 4-30 P.M. today.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಇ. ನಾರಾಯಣಗೌಡ.—ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ರಚಿತವಾಗಲಿರುವ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಗಳ ಆರ್ಥಿಕ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗಮನವನ್ನು ಕೊಡ ಬೇಕು. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಕಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಿನ 30 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಇ. ನಾರಾಯಣಗೌಡ)

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 165ದ, ಸಬ್-ಕ್ಲಾಸ (2)ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಶೇಕಡ 5ರಷ್ಟು ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂವನ್ನು ಹೆಂಚುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದು ಅಪಾಯಕರ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ, ನಾವು ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯನವರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ, ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯರವರನ್ನು ತುರುವೆಕೆರೆಗೆ ಇನ್ ವೈಟ್‌ಮಾಡಿ, ಹಾರ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ, ಅವರು ಆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿಗೆ 10 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಈ ತರಹ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಬಹುದು. ಈ ಶೇಕಡ 5ರಷ್ಟು ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಕಲೆಕ್ಷನ್ನನ್ನು ಹಂಚುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಅಡ್ಜೆಸ್ಟರಿ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟಿ (ಚಿಕ್ಕನಾಯಕನ ಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಈ ಅಕ್ಟನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಕಲಮು ಇದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ I support all the amendments. ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 130ಕ್ಕೂ, 165ಕ್ಕೂ ಬಹಳ ಸಂಬಂಧವಿದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಂತ್ರಿಗಳು, ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಮತ್ತು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಹಣದ ಕೊರತೆ ಬರುವುದನ್ನು ನಾವು ಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ನೋಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು, ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 165ಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿರುವ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅವರು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅಸತ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು, ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ನಮ್ಮ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟು ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೆ, ಎಷ್ಟು ಆಬ್ಲಿಗೇಟರಿ ಫಂಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳಿವೆಯೋ, ಅಷ್ಟು ಆಬ್ಲಿಗೇಟರಿ ಫಂಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳೂ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಿವೆ. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಒಂದು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ಎರಡು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆದಾಯ ಬಿದೆ; ಅದನ್ನು 10 ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಕೊನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷ 25 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿನಿಂದ ಹಿಡಿದು, 10-15-20-30 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿವರೆಗೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿ ಅದರ ಆದಾಯವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿದೆ. ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಒಂದೂವರೆ ಕೋಟಿಜ ನರಿರುವ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಾಡಿನ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಇಡೀ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಯ 20 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಎಂದರೆ 80 ಲಕ್ಷರೂಪಾಯಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ಬರಬಹುದು.ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳಿಗೆ ಏನು ಆಬ್ಲಿಗೇಟರಿ ಫಂಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳಿವೆಯೋ, ಅವುಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ 80 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತೀರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ! ಇದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ತುಂಬಾ ನಗೆಪಾಟಲಾಗುವ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಕೆಲವು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಲೆ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೆ 97 ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಇದೆ; ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅದು 3·81 ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಆದಾಯ ಬರುವ ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ಒಂದು ಪೌರನಭೆಗೆ ಬರುವಷ್ಟು ಆದಾಯ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಡಿಸ್ಕ್ರಿಷನರಿ ಪವರುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆಬ್ಲಿಗೇಟರಿ ಫಂಕ್ಷನ್ಸ್ ಅಥವ ಆಬ್ಲಿಗೇಟರಿ ರೆಸ್‌ಪಾನ್ಸಿಬಿಲಿಟಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಈಗ ಬರುವ ಆದಾಯ ಸಾಲದು. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಆದಾಯ ನಿಗದಿಮಾಡಿದರೆ, ನಮ್ಮ ಡಿಸ್ಕ್ರಿಷನರಿ ಪವರುಗಳನ್ನು ಆಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನುಮ್ಮನೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತೀರೇ ಏನಃ, ಯಾವ ಪಂಚಾಯತಿಯೂ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯರೂಪಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಆಬ್ಲಿಗೇಟರಿ ಫಂಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳನ್ನು ಅವುಗಳು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಈವಾಗ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಬೋರ್ಡುಗಳ ಆದಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಕೆಟ್ಟ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇದೆಯೋ, ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕೆಟ್ಟ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಅವುಗಳ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರಬಹುದೆಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 130ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸ್ಕೂಲುಗಳು, ಹಾಸ್ಪೆಟಲುಗಳು, ರಸ್ತೆಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಅನೇಕತರಹ ಇರಿಗೇಷನ್ನು ವರ್ಕ್‌ಗಳು, ಮುಂತಾದವುಗಳು ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಇಷ್ಟು ಆದಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂದರೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಆದಾಯವನ್ನು ಸುವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಿತವಾಗಿ ಕಾನೂನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿ, ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಜನಗಳು ಹಣಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬೇಡುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಆಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಫಂಡು ಪ್ರೊವೈಡ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಧರ್ಮ ಮತ್ತು ನ್ಯಾಯ. 20 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಏನಿದೆಯೋ, ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷ 30 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸುವುದು ಅಗತ್ಯ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ, ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅವರನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಈ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಹಂಚುವ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಫೋರ್ಡೆಯವರು, ರ್ಯಾಶನೆಲ್ ಬೇಸಿಸ್‌ಮೇಲೆ, ನ್ಯಾಯನಮ್ಮತವಾದ, ಸಮಾಜವಾದದ ಗುರಿಮೇಲೆ, ಅನೇಕ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ನರಸಿಂಹನ್ನರವರೂ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಕಂದಾಯದಮೇಲೆ ಲೆಕ್ಕಹಾಕಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ, 93 ಪರ್ ಕ್ಯಾಪಿಟ ಕೆಲವು ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಆದಾಯ 93 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರ 20 ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಕೇವಲ 20 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಆದಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಪರ್‌ಕ್ಯಾಪಿಟ 3·08 ಆಗಬಹುದು. ಒಂದು ಲಕ್ಷ ಜನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇರುವ ಯೂನಿಟ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, 3·10 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. 70 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಆದಾಯವಿರುವ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳೂ ಇರುತ್ತವೆ. ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ 20 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇದ್ದು, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ 70 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಆದಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೊಂದು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿರುತ್ತದೆ, ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳ ಆಬ್ಲಿಗೇಟರಿ ಫಂಕ್ಷನ್ನುಗಳೂ ನಿಯಮಗಳೂ ಒಂದೇ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಆದಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿರುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯ ಸಮ್ಮತವಲ್ಲ. ಸಮಾಜವಾದದ ಗುರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅದ ಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಪಾಪ್ಯುಲೇಶನ್ ಬೇಸಿಸ್‌ಮೇಲೆ ಹಂಚುವುದು ನಮಂಜಸ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇಲ್ಸ್‌ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್, ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಇನ್‌ಕಂ, ಮುಂತಾದುದರಿಂದ ಬರುವ ಆದಾಯವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಹಂಚುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ; ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಜನರಲ್ ಪೂರ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಹಂಚಬೇಕು. ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗೆ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿ ಹಂಚಿದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ; ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಧರ್ಮವಿದೆ. ಪಾಪ್ಯುಲೇಶನ್‌ಮೇಲೆ ಅಸ್ಸೆಸ್ಸ್‌ಮೆಂ ಮಾಡುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯ ಸಮ್ಮತ ಎಂದು ಒತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, on the floor of this House yesterday while

talking about the financial allocation to Village Panchayats, I made it abundantly clear that on behalf of the Government no rational basis for allocation of funds has been put forward before the House. I am glad in a way that some members from the Treasury Benches and from the Ruling Party have brought amendments to prove the theory of the statement that I made. Even from the stage when the matter was being discussed in the Select Committee, I have been requesting Government to furnish detailed statements showing Village Panchayats and Taluk Boards which would benefit or the extent to which they would be benefited in the allocation proposed by the Bill either according to the original rate or the revised rate accepted by the Government. My friend Sri Ghorpade has taken the trouble of suggesting some amendments. He at least had taken the trouble to make representative sample of the various village panchayats to prove the correctness of the statement. He gave only two examples of Sandur area and another of Bijapur area. I do not think, we can argue that the basis of calculation would be wrong. But taken as a general proposition, the distribution of finances on the basis of population is an accepted basis for allotment of funds. Even at this stage, I want the Government to seriously consider this matter. If the remedy that they propose is going to prove worse than the disease, then what is the use of having this Bill passed on the floor of this House? I am not going to say, that the basis of allocation which is now agreed upon by the Government is correct, nor am I going to say that the one suggested is going to be the panacea for all evils. Let the Hon'ble Members of this House be given facts and figures to draw conclusions. Let them give a definite basis. Even at this stage, I would like the postponement of the consideration of this Bill, because we should not repent at a later stage for doing something in such a hurry. Let us not rush through this Bill and put it on the statute book. From all the speeches made by Sri Narasimhan, Sri Ghorpade and Sri Rajiah Setty and one or two others, it is very clear that it is not likely to bring satisfaction to the Taluk Boards. My greatest surprise is that the members of the ruling party allowed an allocation like this to be voted upon yesterday when I made this very same plea on behalf of the Village Panchayats. That is what depresses me and what pains me because when I said that the basis of allocation of funds has no rational behind it because there is discrimination as between irrigated and non-irrigated area, as between developed and undeveloped areas. I do not know why it did not appeal to my friends on the other side. I did not talk as party man. I was talking from the point of view of securing justice to the areas where justice was badly needed. I also mentioned if I remember correctly that when this becomes law, the Government should not try to create more troubles than what they have at present. The village panchayats should feel that they have some foundation to work on. Whatever they want to do, for developing the areas, the should have some kind of basis or support from Government. My friend Sri Ghorpade said that even if we had made definite allocation for meeting establishment charges and committed yourself in the Bill that you will bear the establishment charges, it would be a great step forward. The Government seems to labour under the impression that when they very generously agreed to increase the allocation from 20 per cent of land revenue to 30 per cent and if it is flashed by the Papers in the headlines, it is likely to mislead people. I do not want to make any allegation at all. I am earnest that whatever we decide upon, it should really benefit the people for whom it is intended. Otherwise, what is the object of having this measure passed at all? Even now, I would be grateful if the Hon'ble Minister will get detailed statements prepared indicating how the proposed measure is likely to benefit the irrigated areas and non-irrigated areas, how it would affect backward areas and how it is likely to adversely affect even the developed areas. Further I want also

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

to request the Hon'ble Minister to say how the proposed allocation of my friend Sri Ghorpade will also affect the village panchayats and taluk boards concerned. It is only then that this Hon'ble House will have some basis for talking or arguing because otherwise we are all talking without facts. I wish to mention further that I am also supporting the amendment suggested by my friend Sri Narayana Gowda. Instead of the Government reserving to itself the power to allocate 5 per cent of the State Revenues to the various Taluk Boards, it is much better that they consult the District Development Council which they propose to set up. About District Development Council itself, I have a great deal to say later. It will be one more stage when the Government will take the people of the local area concerned into confidence in trying to devise measures for the development of the area. In any case, I do not wish to make a long speech. I want the Hon'ble Minister to kindly enlighten us on the point if he has got any facts and figures to prove that what we are now saying is wrong and the apprehensions are unreasonable and unfounded and what is suggested by Sri Ghorpade has no rational basis behind it. Then we are prepared to withdraw the amendment.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, 165 ನೆಯ ಕಲಂನಲ್ಲಿ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನನ್ನೆಯ ದಿವಸ ಸಬ್‌ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ (1) ರಲ್ಲಿ for the word "twenty" 'the word "thirty" shall be substituted ಎನ್ನುವ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಶ್ರೀಮತ್ ಎ. ಎಸ್. ಪಾಟೀಲರವರು ಮತ್ತು ಇ. ನಾರಾಯಣಗೌಡರು ಆಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಚಾದ ವಿವಾದಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ಭಾದಕ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ (2) ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಐದು ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ನಾವು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅದು ಅಷ್ಟು ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಐದು ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್, ನಾಲ್ಕು ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಮೂರು ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದನ್ನು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನ್ ಆಫೀಷಿಯಲ್ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದು ಎರೆಕ್ಟೆಡ್ ಬಾಡಿ ಅವರು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. "Discretionary power vested in Government." ಸರ್ಕಾರ ತನಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದಾಗ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಏರಿಯಾಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಭಾಗದ ಸದಸ್ಯರಲ್ಲೂ ಅನುಮಾನ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಡಿಸಿಪ್ಲಿನ್, ಶಿಸ್ತು ಸಂಯಮಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾರ್ಟಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೈ ಎತ್ತುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹಣ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ತೀರ್ಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಿ. ನೀವು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅನುಮಾನಗ್ರಸ್ತವಾದ ವಾದ ವಿವಾದಗಳಿಗೆ ಎಡೆಕೊಡುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದರಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ವಾದ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಬ್ಸರ್ವರಿ ಡ್ಯೂಟೀಸ್ ಎಂದು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ದುಡ್ಡು ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲು ಶಕ್ಯ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಶ್ರೀ ಬೊಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡರು, ಶ್ರೀ ದೇಸಾಯಿಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರಂತಹ ದೇಶದ ಭಾರವನ್ನು ಹೊರತಕ್ಕ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಶಿಸ್ತಿನ ಶಿಫಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡುವದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಬರೀ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬುಗರಿ ಆಡಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಷನರಿ ಪವರ್ಸ್ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು? ಕೆರೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವುದು, ನ್ಯೂಲು ತೆರೆಯುವುದು, ಅನ್ಪತ್ರೆ ಓಪನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಇವುಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ದುಡ್ಡು ಕೊಡುವ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು? ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಏನು ರೆಕಮೆಂಡ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಿ. ಆ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿಯನ್ನು ನೀವು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು? ಶ್ರೀ ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯರವರ ಹತ್ತಿರ ನರಸಿಂಹರೆಡ್ಡಿಯವರು ಹೋದರೆ, ಪಾರ್ಟಿ ಮನುಷ್ಯ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು, ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ ಬೇಕಾದವನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು ಎಂದು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಇಕ್ಕಟ್ಟಿನ ಪ್ರಸಂಗಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಿ? ಐದು ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್, ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಐದು, ನಾಲ್ಕು, ಮೂರು ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಿ. ಅವರ ತಲೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕಿ. ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಷನರಿ ಪವರ್ಸ್ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾರದ ಟೀಕೆ ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಬೇಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹನ್.—ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಕನ್‌ಸಲ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು?

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಎರೆಕ್ಟೆಡ್ ಮೆಂಬರ್ಸ್ ಎಕ್ಸ್ ಆಫೀಷಿಯೋ ಮೆಂಬರ್ಸ್ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪನವರ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ಅನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಭರವಸೆ ಇದೆ. ಎರೆಕ್ಟೆಡ್ ಮೆಂಬರ್ಸ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ವಾದ ವಿವಾದಮಾಡಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಅಥವಾ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇಕ್ಕಿಸ್ಟೆನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಅಥವಾ ಇಕ್ಕಿಸ್ಟೆನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತಿಳಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಎಷ್ಟು ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಇಂಡಿವಿಜುಯಲ್ ಇನ್‌ಫ್ಲೂಯೆನ್ಸಿಗೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದಾರೆ. ಅಥವಾ ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯನ್ನು

ಉಳಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮಮೇಲೆ ಇಲ್ಲದ ನಲ್ಲದ ದೋಷಾರೋಪಣೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ನೀವೇ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಶ್ರೀ ಇ. ನಾರಾಯಣಗೌಡರು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಕಡೆಯಿಂದ ಬಂದ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಕೂಡದು ಎನ್ನುವ ಭಾವನೆ ಇರಕೂಡದು. ಈಗ ಎರಡು ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇದು ಸಾಧುವಾಗಿದೆ. ಟೀಕೆ ಟಿಪ್ಪಣಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಗುರಿಯಾಗದೆ ಪಾಪಶೇಷ ಅವರ ತಲೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಹಾಕಿಬಿಡಿ. ಪಾಪಶೇಷದ ಗಂಟನ್ನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ತಲೆಯಮೇಲೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊತ್ತುಕೊಂಡು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಎನಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು? ಏನು ಪರ್ಸೆಂಟ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕಾಸ್ಟಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಟ್ರಾನ್ಸ್‌ಫರ್ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಸಾಧುವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು.)—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಬಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರುವುದು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಕುದುರೆ ಹಾರಿದಹಾಗೆ ಹಾರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವರ ಮನೆಬಾಗಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಂತಹವರಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಗೌರವವಿಲ್ಲ, ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂಇಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನಬಾರದೆಂಬುದು ಅದೇನೋ ಒಂದು ಮಹತ್ವವಾದಂಥ ದೊಡ್ಡಸ್ತಿಕೆ ಯೆಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಇವರು ದೊಡ್ಡಸ್ತಿಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು. ಇವತ್ತು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ, ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಲೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಮಾತನಾಡಲಲ್ಲವೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪವರ್ ಇದೆ, ನಾವು ಕೇಂದ್ರದಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಗ್ರಾಂಟ್ ತರಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ಭರವಸೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಆರೀತಿ ಭರವಸೆ ಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುವುದು ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾ ಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಣ ಸರಿಯಾದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಯಿಂದ ವಿಲೇವಾರಿಯಾಗಬೇಕು. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಶೇಕಡ 80 ಭಾಗದಷ್ಟು ಕೊಡುವು ದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಒಳಗೊಳಗೇ ಕಚ್ಚಾಟಗಳು ಪುರು ವಾಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನವರು ಮತ್ತು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನೊ ಬ್ಬರು ಎತ್ತಿ ಅಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಕಚ್ಚಾಟಗಳು ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರೂ ನನಗೆ ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರಬೇಕು, ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಒಬ್ಬನಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ, ಇನ್ನು ಹತ್ತು ಜನರು ನನಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ದಿವಸಗಳೇ ಆಗಿ ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಸಂದರ್ಭವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಕೊಂಡು ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಪಾಠ ಕಲಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳ ಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮನಸ್ಸುಮಾಡಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಿತ್ರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ನಾರಾಯಣಗೌಡರು ತಂದಿರ ತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಇನ್ನೂ ಸರಿಯಾದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾದವರು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಕಬ್ಬು ಮತ್ತು ಬತ್ತ ಬೆಳೆಯತಕ್ಕ ನೀರಾವರಿ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂದಾಯ ಸೆಸ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಬಂದು ಕೇಳಿ ದರೆ ಆಗ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದೂ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಬ್ಯಾಕ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಏರಿಯಾ ಯಾವುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಅರಿತು ಅನುಕೂಲವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಜಾನಂಖ್ಯೆ ಏರಿಯಾನೋಡಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಹಂಚಬೇಕು. ಈಗಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಂಚುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಬಾಯಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟಿಕ್ ಪ್ಯಾಟರನ್ ಆಫ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದು ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನೇನೋ ಕೇವಲ ಪ್ರಚಾರಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಮಾಡುವು ದಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಆತ್ಮದಲ್ಲಿ ನುಡಿದಿರತಕ್ಕ ನುಡಿ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಗತವಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ನ್ಯಾಯ ವನ್ನು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ಧೇಸಾಯಿ.—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಘೋರ್ಪಡೆಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಹೆಗ್ಗಡೆಯವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಅವರು ಬ್ಯಾಕ್‌ವರ್ಡ್ ಏರಿಯಾದ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ಗ್ರಾಂಟು ಗಳನ್ನು ಹಂಚುವಾಗ ಈ ಕ್ವಿಟಬಲ್ಲಾಗಿ ಹಂಚುವ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಗಿರುವ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹಂಚುವುದಾದರೆ, ಅದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಈಕ್ವಿಟಬಲ್ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯೂಟ್ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಪ್ರಸ್ತುತ ಏನು ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಿನ್ಸಿಪಲ್ಸ್ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೋ, ಏನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲ ನತ್ಯಾಂಶವಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವನದ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರ್ರಿಗೇಟೆಡ್-ನಾನ್ ಇರ್ರಿಗೇಟೆಡ್, ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್-ನಾನ್-ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಏರಿ ಯೂಗಳ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಓವರ್ ಎಂಫಸೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೂ ಅಷ್ಟು ಫಲತಾಂಶ ಬರುವು ದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ. ಅವರು ಪೂರ್ತಿಯಾಗಿ ಅವನ್ನು ವರ್ಕ್‌ಔಟ್ ಮಾಡಲಲ್ಲ. 1 : 60 ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ವರ್ಕ್‌ಔಟ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಇರಿಗೇಟೆಡ್ ಏರೇಜಸ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕರ್ನಾಲಡೇಟೆಡ್ ಅಸೆಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಜನರಲ್ ಡಿಸ್ಕಷನ್ ಆಗುವಾಗ ಕರ್ನಾಲಡೇಟೆಡ್ ಅಸೆಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಟರ್ ರೇಟ್ ಕೂಡ ಇರ್ಕ್ಲೂಡ್ ಆಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನೂಕೂಡ ಪರ್ಸಂಟೇಜ್ ರೀತಿ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಳ್ಳು ತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಈ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅದು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಬೆಟರ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಲೆವಿ ಮತ್ತು ವಾಟರ್ ರೇಟ್-ಇಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಟರ್ ರೇಟ್ ಬೇರೆ ಅಸೆಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಬೇರೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈಗ ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ 1 : 60 ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬರುತ್ತದೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಆಗ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು 1 : 10 ಇದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಕೆ. ರಾಜಯ್ಯಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—1 : 10 ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯ ಆದಾಯವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬನಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಇನ್ನೊಬ್ಬನಿಗೆ ಹತ್ತು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ವಿ. ದೇಸಾಯಿ.—ನಾನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹಣ ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನೂ ಹೇಳಲಲ್ಲ. ಇವತ್ತಿನ ದಿವನ ರ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಶೇಕಡ 15 ಅಥವಾ ಶೇಕಡ 30 ರಂತೆ ಹಂಚುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 15 ರಷ್ಟು, ಬೊಂದಾಯಿ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎ. ದೇಸಾಯಿ)

30 ರಷ್ಟು ಇರ್ರಿಗೇಟೆಡ್ ಮತ್ತು ನಾನ್-ಇರ್ರಿಗೇಟೆಡ್ ಏರಿಯಾದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ವಾಟರ್ ರೇಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಅಸೆಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಎರಡೂ ಕಲಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಎರಡೂ ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ವಾಟರ್‌ರೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪರ್ಸಂಟೇಜ್ ಸಿಕ್ಕುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದ ಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರವೇ 1 : 10 ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ಪ್ರಾಬ್ಲಮ್ಸನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವಾಗ ಇಷ್ಟು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದ್ದರೆ ಏನುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಮಾರ್ಗವಿಲ್ಲ. ಸೋಷಿಯಲಿಸ್ಟಾ ಕ್‌ಪ್ಯಾಟರ್ನ್ ಆಫ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೇ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಹಂಡಬೇಕೆಂದೇನಲ್ಲ. ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ವಿರುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಿದೆ. ಆರೀತಿ ಇರುವುದು ಯೋಗ್ಯ. ಈಗ ತಂದಿರುವ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಇನ್ನು ವರ್ಕ್‌ಔಟ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಬೇಸಿಸ್, ಮತ್ತು ಪಿನ್ನಿ ಪರ್ಸ್ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. It has to be worked out.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಹೇಳುವುದೇನೆಂದರೆ ಈಗ ಶೇಕಡ 30 ಭಾಗದಷ್ಟು ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಸಿಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿನ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಶೇಕಡ 30 ರಂತೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ನರಸಿಂಹನ್ ಅವರು ಕೆಲವು ಅಂಕಿ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೆಳಗಾಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದರೆ ಪರ್ಸಂಟೇಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿಲ್ಲ. ಶೇಕಡ 20 ಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಕಡಿಮೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ I could have agreed. ಅದೇರೀತಿ ಅಸೆಸ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸೇಷ್ ಸಹ ಇಕ್ವಿಸಿಡೆಂಟ್ ಆಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಬದರೆ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಎರ್ನಾದಕ್ಕೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿದೆಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅಲ್ಲಿ 1 : 6 ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಬದರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೈಯೆಸ್ಟ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸೇಷ್ ಇಕ್ವಿಸಿಡೆಂಟ್ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ರಿಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ತೋರಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವರೀತಿ ಅವರು ವರ್ಕ್‌ಔಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದರೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ರೆಪ್ರಸೆಂಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಶೇಕಡ 50 ರಷು ಕಡಿಮೆಮಾಡಿತು. ಡಿಫರೆನ್ಸ್ ನರಿಯಾಗಿ ವರ್ಕ್‌ಔಟ್ ಆಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶ್ರೀ ಘೋರ್ಪಡೆಯವರು ನಲಹೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದನ್ನು ವರ್ಕ್‌ಔಟ್‌ಮಾಡಿ. ಒಂದು ವರ್ಷ ವರ್ಕ್‌ಔಟ್‌ಮಾಡಿ ಆಮೇಲೆ ಕರೆಸಿದರ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಅವರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ವಿತ್‌ಡ್ರಾಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

4 P.M.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಆರ್. ಜಿ. ಕಾಮತ್ (ಅಂಕೋಲ).— ಸ್ಪಾಮಿ, ನಾನೀಗ ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗ್ಗಡೆಯವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ನೀಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಎದ್ದು ನಿಂತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಕೆಲವು ನನ್ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕಾರು ವಾರು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗೇಕೆ ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕ ಅನುಕೂಲ ವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಸಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅನೇಕರಿಗೆ ಆ ಕಾರವಾರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಿತ್ರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಥ ವಿಚಿತ್ರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಿರುವುದರಿಂದಲೇ ಅಲ್ಲಗೆ ವಿಚಿತ್ರ ತರದ ಕಾನೂನು ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಕಾರವಾರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 82 ರಷ್ಟು ಈ ದಿವನ ಅರಣ್ಯ ಪ್ರದೇಶವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆರೀತಿ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಿರುವಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಕೋಲ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 96 ರಷ್ಟು ಅರಣ್ಯ ವಿದೆ. ಸೂಪಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 95 ಅರಣ್ಯ ಪ್ರದೇಶ. ಇನ್ನುಳಿದ ನಾಲ್ಕು ಮತ್ತು ಐದು ಪರ್ಸಂಟ್ ಭೂಮಿ ಉಳುಮೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂತರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರದೇಶ ಶೇಕಡ ನಾಲ್ಕು-ಐದರಷ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಯಿತು. ಇಷ್ಟು ವರಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 20 ರಷ್ಟಲ್ಲ 30 ರಷ್ಟಲ್ಲ 50 ರಷ್ಟು ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಾಗ್ಗೂ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೊರ್ಡುಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿ ಹೇಗಾಗಬೇಕು ? ಈ ಅಂಶವನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ವಿಚಾರಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ನೂರಕ್ಕೆ ನಾಲ್ಕೈದು ಭಾಗದಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಮಾತ್ರ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತೆಯೋ ಅಂಥಕಡೆಗಳವರೆಲ್ಲ ನಾನೇ ಏಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಶ್ರೀ ರಾಮಕೃಷ್ಣ ಹೆಗ್ಗಡೆಯವರೇ ಏಕೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂಕೂಡ ಇಂಥ ಉಪನೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರಲೇಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ನಮ್ಮ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಬಹಳ ದೂರದೂರಕ್ಕೆ ಇದ್ದು ಉದ್ದವಾದ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಳೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಬೀಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ಬೇಗ ಕೆಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗುತ್ತವೆ. ನಾರಾಕ್ಕೆ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂಲುಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಶೇಕಡ 25 ಅಲ್ಲ ಶೇಕಡ 40 ಕೊಟ್ಟರೂ ಮಾಡಲಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈಗ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಅರಣ್ಯಗಳ ವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ವರಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಐದರಷ್ಟು ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯನ್ನು—ಈ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕ್ ಬೊರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮಪಂಚಾಯತಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಇಂಥ ಉಪಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೇ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಬೇಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಹಳೇ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಆಕ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 105 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಅರಣ್ಯ ವರಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ—ರಸ್ತೆಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ನಿಯಮವಿದುತ್ತೆ. ಈಗ ನಮಗೆ ಆ ಹಳೆ ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಅರಣ್ಯ ಶಾಸನದ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಕೆಯೂಸಹ ತಪ್ಪಿಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸಿಕ್ಕಬೇಕಾದ ಬೇರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳೂ ಸಹ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿವೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾ ಆ ಮುಂಬೈ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲದ್ದಾಗ ಈ ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ವರಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಎರಡರಷ್ಟನ್ನು ನಾವು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆವು. ಈಗ ಅದೆಲ್ಲಾ ತಪ್ಪಿ ಹೋಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಈ ಫಾರೆಸ್ಟ್ ಉತ್ಪನ್ನವಿದೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ ಐದರಷ್ಟು ಮಾಗಣಿಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ಅಕೌಂಟ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಹತ್ತು-ಹದಿನೈದು ಜನ ಈ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಆ ನಮ್ಮ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಗೆ ಬಂದಿದ್ದಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಪರಿಚಯವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ತಕ್ಕಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ನಾವು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಖಾತರಿ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಆ ಕಾರವಾರ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಪ್ರಸಂಗದಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೂ ಆ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲ ಈ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಲಭಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೇ ಬೇಕು. ಒಟ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಶೇಕಡ 50 ರಷ್ಟು ಜಮೀನು ಅರಣ್ಯ ಪ್ರದೇಶವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅಂಥ ಪ್ರದೇಶಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಈ ಸೂಚನೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತೆಯಾದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—Sir, I would first deal with the amendment

of my friend Sri Ramakrishna Hegde. It is true that in North Kanara District and several other parts of the State, we have vast, extensive forest areas and the land revenue on lands collected there is almost incomparable with the land revenue in other parts. Therefore, they need help. The Government have been helping the village panchayats and the district boards by *ad hoc* grants every year. Even in the budget of this year, we have set apart 4 lakhs of rupees to be given to the North Kanara District for the development of these places. So, we intend to continue the grant necessary from the forest revenue to the taluk boards and village panchayats in the North Kanara area, as also in other places where forest is more than 50 per cent. A special provision need not be made. I assure the Hon. Members that we will give them whatever is necessary; it may be more then 5 per cent. It may be 10 per cent. The amount of grant which would be necessary to bring about parity between the amount available to other panchayats and the amount available in North Kanara District, would be given. With this assurance, I request Sri Hegde to withdraw his amendment.

The next point is about the increase of assignment from 20 per cent to 30 per cent. I am sorry the finances of the State will not permit the raising of this percentage. In view of the various commitments that we have made with regard to the plan, we cannot now increase the grant to taluk boards from 20 to 30 per cent. and therefore I cannot accept the amendment. It may look reasonable and Members may say that since we have raised the grant to panchyats it should be done in the case of taluk boards also. I am very sorry I have not been able to do it, however willing I might be. Under these circumstances, I cannot accept it.

With regard to the mode of assignment, Sri Ghorpade's formula, though it looks very reasonable, has to be worked out fully before we come to proper conclusions. But I am not prepared to postpone consideration of this Bill on that account. Sri Mallaradhya has suggested that we should try the formula contained in the Bill. I agree with him. If there is any disparity to day, I am able to say that we will be able to reduce it in course of time. For example there are Charak and Be-Charak villages. The Be-Charak revenue assessment will not go to the Charak villages alone. One Be-charak village may be added to a charak village, where assessment will be very small. By some such mode, we will be able to reduce the disparity between village and village.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The question is about taluk boards, not panchayats.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—From taluk to taluk also. We can do that. In a particular taluk there are several Becharak villages, uninhabitated villages. The revenue of these villages can be taken into consideration while allotting 5 per cent of the land revenue to taluk boards. Beyond that, by giving grants, we may be able to lessen the differences. There are several methods, besides the one I have suggested. Government have several grants to give. Regarding Sri Ghorpade's amendment, though I am inclined to agree with it, it deserves further consideration at the hands of this House. I am of opinion that now it is not proper for us to stop and begin considering his suggestion. We will push through this Bill and at the very earliest opportunity, if we find that this system is not workable, we may think of introducing an amendment to bring about a change.

There was the other aspect of the case suggested by my Hon'ble friend that the Government should not have any discretionary grarts at their disposal. I am not prepared to agree with them. Their arguments are not convincing to me and so I do not want to reply to them. I oppose all the amendments. I request Sri Ramakrishna Hegde and Sri Ghorpade to kindly withdraw their amendments.

Sri M.Y. GHORPADE.—I beg leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Sri RAMAKRISHNA HEGDE.—In view of the assurance given by the Minister I want to withdraw my amendment.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Sri B. L. NARAYANASWAMY (Mulbagal).—May I know why the Minister does not make an appeal to the other members also to withdraw their amendments.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I am sorry for the delay. I appeal to all my friends to withdraw their amendments.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I want leave of the House to withdraw my amendment?

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

Sri E. NARAYANA GOWDA.—I am pressing my amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

'In sub-clause (1), for the word "twenty" the word "thirty" be substituted.'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 165 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 165 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 166.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I do not want to move my amendments to clauses 166 and 171.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA.—I am not moving my amendment to insert the new clause 165A.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clauses 166 to 173 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 166 to 173 were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 174.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I beg to move:

'In sub-clause (1) for the words "and the first day of January" the words "and the fifteenth day of December" shall be substituted.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'In sub-clause (1) for the words "and the first day of January" the words "and the fifteenth day of December" shall be substituted.'

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If the time is given up to 1st of January the difficulty will be, that the budget will have to be passed by the District Council by that time. Most of the District Council members being also members of the Legislature will find it difficult to attend the meetings of the District Council because in the month of February we will be considering our budget. So this will lead to some difficulty, but if it is held earlier it will be convenient to the members of the Legislature to attend the budget session and also the meeting of the District Council.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I do not accept the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

'In sub-clause (1) for the words "and the first day of January" the words 'and the fifteenth day of December' shall be substituted."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I will put clauses 174 and 175 to House. The question is:

"That Clauses 174 and 175 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 174 and 175 were added to the Bill.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I do not want to move my amendment to clause 176.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clauses 176 to 186 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 176 to 186 were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 187.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I beg to move:

"1. Item (v) of sub-clause (2) shall be deleted."

"2. The following sub-clause shall be added to the clause:

'(4) Government may permit officers of the Development Department of each district to attend meetings of the District Development Council by invitation'."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

"1. Item (v) of sub-clause (2) shall be deleted:

"2. The following sub-clause shall be added to the clause:

"(4) Government may permit officers of the Development Department of each district to attend meetings of the District Development Council by invitation"."

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I do not understand why this innocus District Council should be burdened with officers. If there is any need for the assistance and the guidance of these officers, Government may ask any one or all of them to attend the meetings and give the necessary advice and guidance. But why should they be regular members of the District Council? We are against this particular Council being flooded with offieers.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.— I oppose the amendment. If my friend goes through the Balwantrai Mehta Committee report, at the District Council level no distinction is tried to be made between officials and non-officials.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"1. Item (v) of sub-clause (2) shall be deleted,"

"2. The following sub-clause shall be added to the clause!

"(4) Government may permit officers of the Development Department of each District to attend meetings of the District Development Council by invitation."

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 187 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 187 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 188.

Sri K. MALLAPPA (Mercara).—I do not want to move my amendment.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I beg to move:

'The following clause shall be substituted for the existing clause:—

"(1) The President of the Council shall be appointed by the Government from among the members of the Parliament (Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha) or Local Legislature;

(2) The Government may appoint the Deputy Commissioner of the district as the Secretary to the Council."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'The following clause shall be substituted for the existing clause:—

"(1) The President of the Council shall be appointed by the Government from among the members of the Parliament (Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha) or Local Legislature;

(2) The Government may appoint the Deputy Commissioner of the district as the Secretary to the Council."

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—Sir, I beg to move:

'The following clause shall be substituted for the existing clause:-

"(1) One of the non-official members of the Council shall be elected as the President of the District Council by secret ballot in accordance with such rules as may be prescribed;

(2) The Deputy Commissioner of the district shall *ex-officio* be the Secretary of the Council." '

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'The following clause shall be substituted for the existing clause:-

"(1) One of the non-official members of the Council shall be elected as the President of the District Council by secret ballot in accordance with such rules as may be prescribed;

(2) The Deputy Commissioner of the district shall *ex-officio* be the Secretary of the Council".'

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I am prepared to accept the amendment proposed by my colleague Sri Puttaramiya. We on this side have conscientious objection to making the Deputy Commissioner of the District the President of the District Development Council. If the previous history of the administration of local self-governing institutions in Mysore State is any indication, I do not think Government can justify the inclusion of this clause in the Bill. I have the greatest admiration for the type of work which the Deputy Commissioners are doing with a sense of devotion and energy, but where development works are concerned, I am afraid that has not received adequate attention from the generality of the Deputy Commissioners throughout the State. I am making this responsible statement having had experience of the administration when I was in charge of development. In the midst of their multifarious duties, our experience is that very often this development work is neglected by Deputy Commissioners. Even with reference to the existing community development works and N.E.S. Blocks if sufficient progress has not been made as one expected, it is entirely due to the lapses on the part of the Deputy Commissioners who are supposed to be the main spring of activities at the district level.

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—As a retired officer, is the Hon'ble member in order in making a confession like this?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I know what Dr. Nagan Gowda says. I remember the time when I motored with him to Kankanhalli when he was Minister and I was Commissioner for Development. I gave him a complete history of the state of progress of development in many of the districts. He argued with me and I thought I had convinced him. He knew that development work in the districts was not progressing in the manner which Government expected. Rural development work has got such a long history dating back to 50 years. I have got the greatest admiration for officers in charge of districts who have done very well, but so far as development work is concerned, they have not done well. It is entirely due to lapse on their part. There is one other aspect. There is the present pattern of development work envisaged in the democratic set up. There is the Planning Commission consisting of a number of non-officials. Similarly you have got village panchayats and taluk boards and at the district level you must have an agency which is sufficiently competent, with men of status, with men of influence, understanding and all that and now for Government to ask that this council consisting of representatives of the Legislature or Parliament and the intelligentsia should be presided over by an official, is I consider, a direct insult thrown at the face of the legislators. I would not be a member of a Development Council where Government wants to perpetuate this kind of thing. I am not ashamed to sit with any official and work with him, but what is the democracy that you are trying to perpetuate; what kind of decentralisation that you are thinking of; do yon mean to say that a non-official cannot be a Chairman and plan for the district;

is he not in a position to advise Government or the taluk board; do you mean to say that he cannot carry the entire district with him; do you think that talent is bankrupt in non-official circles? I think he is sufficiently competent to manage the entire development work. The Minister referred to the fact that it will involve a lot of expense. I object to the Government approach to this problem in having visualised a kind of Development Council, with neither powers, nor status, nor influence. Even for such a body they do not want to have a non-official. What exactly is the approach or the attitude of the Government, passes my comprehension. Very conscientious objections are made to have a non-official as the President of the Council. One argument Government may advance is, the Deputy Commissioner being in charge of the district, and being in touch with both the taluk board and the village panchayat, it is not correct that we lose his services. Let him be the Secretary of the Development Council; that is my suggestion. The block development officer or the Tahsildar is the chief executive officer of the taluk board. Let the Deputy Commissioner whom they consider as the man who is indispensable for development work, assist the District Development Council; he will be in touch with various aspects of the development; let him be the Secretary of the Development Council.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಚಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಪಾಂಡವಪುರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ಶ್ರೀವಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರವರು ಈಗ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು, ಸರಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ನಾನೇನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ರೆಜಿಸ್ಲೇಟೀವ್ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರು, ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಡೆವಲಪ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೆಂಬರಾಗಿರುವ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ, ಆ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಯನ್ನು ಚೇರ್‌ಮ್ಯಾರಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ: ನಾನ್ ಆಫಿಷಿಯಲ್‌ಹೈಸಿಡೆಂಟರನ್ನು ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ನರಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಯಾವ ನಿರ್ಬಂಧವನ್ನೂ ಮಾಡದೇ ನಾನ್ ಆಫಿಷಿಯರ್‌ಮೆಂಬರಾಗಿರುವವರನ್ನೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಅಮೆಂಡ್‌ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಿಷ್ಟೇ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸುಬ್ರಮಣ್ಯರವರು ಏನು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೋರಾಡಿದರೋ ಅದನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅನುಸರಿಸದೇ ತಂದಿರುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂತಹ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ (I do not want to disclose) ಯಾರು ಈ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಹೋರಾಡಿದರೋ ಅಂತಹವರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಂತಹವರು Deputy Commissioner ರವರನ್ನು Chairmanಆಗಿ ಮಾಡಿ ಅವರಿಗೇ ಎಲ್ಲ Powers ಗಳನ್ನು ಏನೇನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವ ವಿವರಗಳೆಲ್ಲ ಇಲ್ಲಿನ section 189ರಲ್ಲೇ ಇದೆ. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನ ಬಜೆಟ್ಟನ್ನು approve ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೂ Sanction ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ Functionಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ಇಲ್ಲಿರುವ 189ನೇ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು ಅಷ್ಟದಿಗ್ಗಜಗಳಂತೆ ಇರುವಂತಹ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು. ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳೂ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿರುವಾಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿರುವ Chairman ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. L.A. ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳಾಗಲೀ, ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟಿನ ಮೆಂಬರಾಗಲೀ ಜಿಲ್ಲಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ನೀವು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿರುವುದು ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಿದ್ದುದರಿಂದಲ್ಲವೇ? ರಾಜ್ಯವಾಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇದೆ, ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆ ಇದೆ, ಘನತೆ ಇದೆ, ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯವಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ಬಾಕಿ Elected Representatives ಗಳು ನಿಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಚುನಾಯಿಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿರುವುದು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಾನ, ಮರ್ಯಾದೆ, ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಮಾಡಿದರೇ? ಹಾಗೆ ಘನತೆ, ಗಾಂಭೀರ್ಯಗಳಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಯಾವ ಒಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಲೀ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಳ್ಳಲೇಬೇಕಾಗಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. Allow him to do some work as Secretary. ಹೀಗೆ Deputy Commissionerನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಹಿಂದಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಇಂತಹ ಜವಾಬ್ದಾರಿ ಸ್ಥಾನಗಳಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೂ ನಾಮಕರಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ಹಿಂದೆಯೇ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಯಾವ ವರ್ಗದ ಸದಸ್ಯರನ್ನೇ ಆಗಲೀ ಖಡಾಖಂಡಿತವಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆದು ಹಾಕಬಹುದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಎಲ್ಲ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ proceedingsನಲ್ಲೇ ಪ್ರಿಂಟಾಗಿವೆ. ಅಂತಹವರು ಈಗ Deputy Commissionerರವರನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ತಲೆಯಮೇಲೆ Chairmanರಾಗಿ ಏಕಿರಬೇಕು? ನೀವು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು. ನಾವು ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾಗಿ ನೀವು, ನಾವೂ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಸೇರಿ ದೇಶದ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿಯೇ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದು. ಹಿಂದೆ District Boardನ Chairmanರಾಗಿ ಎಜ್ಯೂಕೇಷನ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಲ್ಲದವರು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿರಲಿಲ್ಲವೇ? What is the motive behind it? I cannot understand. ಸರಕಾರ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಏಕೆ ಹಠ ಹಿಡಿದಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಇದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾದರೂ ಏನು? ಈ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಬೋರ್ಡಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ)

ನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಪೈಕಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒಬ್ಬರು Secretary ಗಳಾಗಿ ಆರಿಸಿಬರಬಹುದು. ಕಾಂಗ್ರೆಸ್ಸಿನವರಾದರೂ ಬರಲೀ, ಕಮ್ಯೂನಿಷ್ಟ್ರರಾಗಲೀ ಬರಲಿ, P.S.P. ಯವರಾಗಲೀ ಎಲೆಕ್ಷಾಗಿ ಬರಲಿ.

ಒಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯನನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿರಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಾಗ, ಪಾರ್ಟಿ, ಪಂಗಡಗಳ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ನಾನು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನೀವು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಲಾಯರುಗಿರಿಯನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಚುನಾಯಿತರಾಗಿ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲವೇ; ಅದಕ್ಕೇ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ ನೀವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖಂಡರಾಗಿರುವುದು. ಹಾಗೆ ಇದ್ದೂ ಈ ರೀತಿ ತರುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮಗೆ ಪ್ರಜಾ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ತೋರಿಸದೆ ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಇರಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I don't accept the amendment.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I shall now put the amendment of Sri Mallaradhya to vote. The question is:

'That the following clause shall be substituted for the existing clause:—

"(1) The President of the Council shall be appointed by the Government from among the members of the Parliament (Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha) or Local Legislature;

(2) The Government may appoint the Deputy Commissioner of the district as the Secretary to the Council."'

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Now the amendment of Sri B. K. Puttaramaiya. The question is:

'That the following clause shall be substituted for the existing clause:—

"(1) One of the non-official members of the Council shall be elected as the President of the District Council by secret ballot in accordance with such rules as may be prescribed;

(2) The Deputy Commissioner of the district shall *ex-officio* be the Secretary of the Council."'

The motion was negatived.

4-30 P.M.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—What about the amendment of Sri K. Mallappa to clause 188?

Sri K. MALLAPPA.—I am not moving, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"Clauses 188 to 226 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 188 to 226 were added to the Bill.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Clause 227. I beg to move:

"For the words 'other authority' the words 'any other non-official agency' shall be substituted."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'For the words "other authority" the words "any other non-official agency" shall be substituted.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

'For the words "other authority" the words "any other official agency" shall be substituted'.

The motion was negatived.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 227 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 227 was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clauses 228 to 246 both inclusive do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 228 to 246 were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Schedule 1.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—I am not moving my amendment to Schedule 1, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Schedules 1 and 2 do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Schedules 1 and 2 were added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 81.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I would like to suggest something to the Chair about this amendment, Sir. If you kindly permit me to speak, I shall do so, Sir.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—At 4-30 all the amendments will be put to the vote of the House. That is the understanding.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I invite the attention of the Hon'ble Members to rule 230 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business. It reads thus:

"230: At the appointed hour, in accordance with the allocation of time order, for the completion of a particular stage of a Bill, or other business, the Speaker shall forthwith put every question necessary to dispose of all the outstanding matters in connection with that stage of the Bill or other business."

So, after the appointed hour, we may put the clauses to the vote of the House.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—We do not want to discuss on any of the amendments, Sir.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Hon'ble Member has forgotten that the amendments moved by the Opposition Members were also put to the vote of the House.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—If the Chair puts my amendment to vote, the others fall.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—I am rising to a point of order Sir, When moving the amendment, it does not form part of the procedure. The Minister's amendment is only an information supplied to the members. It has not been taken up. This does not form part of the procedure. Therefore he cannot move and you cannot put it to the vote of the House. You can put the clauses as such for the vote of the House. But so far as amendments are concerned, I may submit to you that this is a sort of an information given to the members. If the member had moved it during the course of the debate, that would have been something.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I am moving it from the Chair.

Sri C. M. ARUMUGHAM.—You can move only clauses. How can you give permission to move the amendments? You have not given permission for the Minister to move the amendment. Therefore this does not form part of the procedure or form part of the Bill. You must enlighten us under what provision you can take this as an amendment.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—We have passed the budget even without a motion from the Minister. All the demands are put from the Chair.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have used my powers. The question is:

'1 In sub-clause (1), the words "a servant of the Panchayats" shall be deleted'

'2 For sub-clause (3), the following sub-clause shall be substituted namely:—

"(3) Government may by general or special order entrust such other duties as it may specify to the Secretary and he shall carry out those duties. On such entrustment the expenditure on account of the salary and allowances of the Secretary shall be apportioned between the Panchayat or Panchayats and the Government in such manner as may be prescribed."'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 81 as amended do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 81 as amended was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 97. The question is:

'1 For sub-clause (1), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely;

"(1) Every Taluk Board shall consist of members directly elected by ballot by the voters in each Taluk to fill the general seats and seats reserved for Scheduled Castes and women in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the rules made thereunder."'

'(2) In sub-clause (2), for the words "shall be entitled to attend every meeting of the Taluk Board and take part in the proceedings but shall not be entitled to vote", the words "shall be entitled to take part in the proceedings of and vote at, the meetings of the Taluk Board", shall be substituted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 97 as amended do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 97 as amended was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 99. The question is:

'For clause 99, the following clauses shall be substituted, namely—

"99. Representation of Scheduled Castes.—Seats shall be reserved in a Taluk Board for the Scheduled Castes, the number of such seats bearing, as nearly as may be, the same proportion to the total number of seats in the Taluk Board as the population of the Scheduled Castes in the Taluk bears to the total population of the Taluk:

Provided that this section shall cease to have effect after the period specified in article 334 of the Constitution:

Provided further that the preceding proviso shall not affect any representation in a Taluk Board until the expiry of the term of office of its members.

Explanation—"Population" for purposes of this section shall be computed in the same manner as is specified in Section 98.

99A. Representation of women.—Seats shall be reserved in every Taluk Board for women, the number of seats so reservad being not more than two in any Taluk Board."'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 99 as amended stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 99 as amended was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Clause 100. The question is:

'That in sub-clause (1), after item (*c*), the following item shall be inserted, namely—

"(*d*) the number of seats, if any, reserved for Scheduled Castes or women in each constituency."'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That clause 100 as amended do stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 100 as amended was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That (i) in sub-clause (2) the words 'or nominated' shall be omitted;

(ii) for sub-clause (3), the following sub-clause shall be substituted, namely—

'(3) A person shall not be qualified to be chosen from a territorial constituency to fill a seat in a Taluk Board unless,

(i) in the case of a seat reserved for the Scheduled Castes, such person is a member of those castes; and

(ii) in the case of a seat reserved for women, such person is a woman'."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 102, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 102, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA.—I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Village Panchayats and Local Boards Bill, 1959, as reported by the Joint Select Committee and as amended, be passed."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That the Mysore Village Panchayats and Local Boards Bill, 1959, as reported by the Joint Select Committee and as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE TENANCY LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959.

Motion to consider.

†Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA—Sir, I do not propose to advance elaborate arguments in support of the Bill. It is a simple measure. Hon'ble Members are aware that on 1st November 1956 there were different laws in the different regions of the State governing tenancy. With a view to enact uniform legislation, certain interim arrangements were made in that connection and Acts No. 13, 14, 15 and 16 were passed in that year 1957. The provisions of those enactments are due to expire during the calendar year. The Mysore Land Reforms Bill which has been introduced in this Hon'ble House is not likely to become law before the end of this year. Therefore, with a view to extend the life of these enactments, the present Bill is introduced, I commend this measure for the kind consideration of this House.

†Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, this piece of legislation seeks to help the tenant classes. My Hon'ble friend on the other side was pleased to say that we were accustomed—I do not know whether he referred to the practice of this Government to come with piecemeal legislation in instalments with the object of helping the tenants; in actual practice, we find that it has become their habit.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—This is not a piecemeal legislation. This is brought forward with a view to extend the life of the legislation.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Whose life is extended, I do not know by this.